

THE  
**ECLECTIC REVIEW,**

FOR JUNE, 1837.

---

Art. I. *The Case of the Body, of Protestant Dissenting Ministers of the Presbyterian Denomination, in Relation to their Withdrawment from the Independent and Baptist Boards, and the Consequent Dissolution of the General Body of Protestant Dissenting Ministers of the Three Denominations, Residing in and about the Cities of London and Westminster.* London: Smallfield & Son. 1837.

**T**HE Body of Protestant Dissenting Ministers of the Presbyterian Denomination, residing in and about the Cities of London and Westminster, at an EXTRAORDINARY MEETING, held at Dr. Williams's Library, Red-Cross Street, on the 4th of March, 1836, the Rev. Joseph Hutton, LL.D., in the chair, passed the following Resolutions:—

‘That this Body, being one of three Bodies which constitute the General Body of Protestant Dissenting Ministers of the Three Denominations in and about the Cities of London and Westminster, feels itself impelled, at the present crisis, to take prompt and decisive measures for the assertion of its independence, and the preservation of its rights and privileges.

‘That the Three Bodies of Protestant Dissenting Ministers formed themselves into an United Body, upwards of a century ago, for the maintenance and extension of civil and religious liberty, upon the understanding and engagement that the Bodies should not call in question or interfere with each other's religious opinions and doctrines; the only terms of association, with regard to individual members of the respective Bodies, being their standing ‘accepted and approved’ in their several denominations.

‘That, notwithstanding known differences of judgment in religious matters between the three Bodies, and, in some instances, between the members of the same Body, the Catholic principle of the Union was,

VOL. I.



37  
6/6.  
121

S S

for a very long period, sacredly observed, and the United Body consequently proceeded in peace and harmony, and by their cordial co-operation rendered eminent services to the cause of religious liberty; the Presbyterian Body being certainly not behind the two others in zeal and exertion.

‘That we lament that, within these few years, the Catholic principle of union has been infringed, by allowed references, at general meetings and in public proceedings, to doctrinal differences subsisting between the Bodies, and the members of the same Body, accompanied by reflections and insinuations, to the prejudice particularly of the Presbyterian Body.

‘That we record with pain, that at the last election of the Secretary to the General Body, a most valuable and universally respected member of *this* Body, who had, by the suffrages of the United Body, filled the secretaryship for seven years, with such punctuality, diligence, and ability as procured for him the warm thanks often repeated of the whole Body, was set aside, on the ground openly alleged, and even declared in print, of his religious views on points of doctrine, and those of the Body to which he belongs, not being consonant to those of the majority of the Three Denominations.

‘That we perceive, with feelings of deep regret, the same spirit of intolerance and exclusion in the resolution of the Anti-pædobaptist Body, not to admit to membership hereafter any minister, though hitherto eligible, who shall not profess certain articles of religious belief; and in the subsequent determination of the General Body, upon the appeal of the aggrieved party, to take no measure for the relief of ministers who may thus be proscribed for conscience’ sake.

‘That our serious attention has been also, and of necessity, drawn to various public proceedings of individuals and parties of the two other denominations; proceedings notoriously assisted by certain leading ministers of one at least of those denominations,—openly applauded by others,—and approved, it is apprehended, by the greater part of them,—the object or sure tendency of which is to degrade the English Presbyterians in public estimation, to deprive them of rights and privileges until this period never disputed, and even to revive against them, by means of legal technicalities, the penal statutes, which the wisdom and justice of the legislature had repealed, to the satisfaction and joy of all enlightened men in the nation, and so far to thrust them out of the pale of civil protection.

‘That, contemplating these proceedings and various indications of the disposition of the majority of the Members of the United Body of Ministers, we cannot entertain a doubt that it is the wish and purpose of such majority eventually to exclude the Presbyterian Body from the Union, or to make its relative position such as no religious body, alive to its own dignity, could consent to occupy.

‘That, therefore, we feel it to be an imperative though painful duty,—imposed upon us equally by regard to our own character as Protestant Dissenting Ministers, who hold it to be one of the inalienable rights of conscience, that no man shall, without his own consent, be answerable to another for his honest judgment upon the sense of



the Holy Scriptures, by respect for the memory of those that went before us and laid the foundation of our freedom, and by regard to the welfare of those that shall come after us,—to withdraw as a Body from an Union, the compact of which has been violated, and in which we can see no prospect of equal and peaceful co-operation, or of real and effective service to the interests of religious liberty,' &c.\*

At the Annual Meeting of the General Body of the 'Three Denominations of Protestant Dissenting Ministers residing in and about the Cities of London and Westminster, held by adjournment at Dr. Williams's Library, Red-Cross Street, April 18, 1836, it was unanimously resolved—

'(1.) That from the passing of the Act of Uniformity in 1662, till the demise of King William III., in 1702, the Protestant Nonconformist Ministers of the several denominations of Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Anti-pædobaptists, residing in and about the cities of London and Westminster, held occasional meetings of their respective denominations, for the purpose of presenting petitions and addresses to the throne on such matters as affected their rights as Protestant Ministers, or respected the general interests of civil and religious liberty.

'(2.) That on the accession of Queen Anne, in 1702, the 'Three Denominations,' for the first time, united in an Address to her Majesty; and since that period have been accustomed to hold united meetings; that in their collective capacity as 'the Protestant Dissenting Ministers' of the Three Denominations residing in and about the cities of London and Westminster, they have enjoyed the privilege of access to the Throne in each successive reign to the present time, and of presenting addresses by deputation, as circumstances rendered expedient.

'(3.) That some time after they had been recognised by the Government as a body enjoying these privileges, the Ministers formed themselves into separate and distinct bodies, known respectively by the names of 'The Presbyterian Body,' 'The Congregational Board,' and the 'Anti-pædobaptist Board;' that the first general meeting of the Three Denominations, after the separate bodies were organised, was held on the 11th of July, 1727. That in these separate bodies the ministers of each denomination have formed their own internal arrangements, and reported, from time to time, such ministers as were added to their number, and had been 'accepted and approved in their several denominations.' Thus introduced to the General Body they have severally continued members during life, unless they violated the standing laws of the union; were officially notified as no longer members of the body to which they respectively belonged; voluntarily withdrew from the union, or were excluded by a vote of the general body.†

---

\* The conclusion is omitted, as it is merely an expression of feeling.

† Five resolutions are omitted, as they refer to the election of the Secretary, and other details unconnected with the general argument.

'(9.) That the recent withdrawment of certain Unitarian members of the Presbyterian Body from the General Union has not affected, and does not affect, the existence, constitution and objects of the Union. That those members, who are in every respect Presbyterians, and have been for many years members of the General Body, still continue to sustain that relation; that their protest against the secession of the Presbyterian Body, and the reasons alleged in support of their continued connexion with the Union, have been cordially approved by the General Body; that the Union of the Ministers of the Three Denominations is thus inviolably preserved; and that the representations given to his Majesty's Government and the public, of the 'Union being dissolved,' because certain ministers of Unitarian principles have withdrawn from a Body still consisting of more than 140 ministers, are contrary to fact, and adapted to produce unwarranted and unjust impressions.

'(10.) That the imputations contained in the alleged 'reasons for withdrawment by the seceding ministers,' reflecting on the General Body, as if any of its members were desirous of depriving them of their civil rights, or of 'reviving the operation of penal statutes,' are unworthy of the character of any party professing to regard the dictates of truth, justice, and charity.

F. A. Cox, D.D., LL.D., Chairman.

G. CLAYTON, Secretary to the General Board.

The Members of the Presbyterian Body, at an Extraordinary Meeting, held at Dr. Williams's Library, Red-Cross Street, on the 2nd of May, 1836, passed several counter-resolutions, which thus closed: 'That it be referred to a Committee, now appointed, to draw up and to publish, without delay, a statement in justification of such of the foregoing resolutions as relate to the Resolutions of the Two Denominations.'

The Presbyterian Committee being duly and formally appointed on the said 2nd of May, proceeded, slowly and deliberately, to concoct its Report, which was in due course presented on the 1st of December, 1836, and published in February, 1837. Whether this elaborate document, subsequent to its presentation, received any further revisal or correction, we cannot decide; but, however that may have been, after a period, as near as may be, of ten lunar months, duly fulfilled in its conception, gestation, and growth, this Presbyterian 'case' first saw the light. We mention this circumstance because we would not have our readers think, that we are about to examine a premature or hasty production.

The controversy, however, must be understood, before the merits of 'the case' can be examined. Our readers then should know that, because the General Body of Protestant Dissenting Ministers did elect, to be its Secretary, the Rev. George Clayton, when it ought, for divers reasons, to have elected the Rev. Dr. Rees;—and also, because it did not provide for the recognition

as genuine Baptists of certain hypothetical, though not hypothetical candidates, who, though immersed, were, in the judgment of the Baptists, who best understand such matters, not properly immersed, or not proper to be immersed, or on some account not proper presentable Anti-pædobaptist ministers;—and further, because there were ‘allowed references to doctrinal differences, ‘accompanied by reflections and insinuations;’ that is, allowed by the chairman, for the time being, whose business it was to allow no such thing, and who was often, as on the occasion more particularly referred to, a good substantial Presbyterian;—and, withal, because some ‘individuals and parties,’ ‘notoriously assisted by certain leading ministers of one, at least, of the denominations,’ did, or said, or wrote, something, it is not explicitly stated what, but undoubtedly, from the indignation expressed towards even the accessories, something very wicked; because of some or of all these reasons, an ‘engagement’ has been pronounced broken, a ‘compact has been declared violated,’ and the Presbyterian body have resolved, with the exception of three Scotchmen, who, it is intimated, were members ‘by courtesy,’ and ‘not of right,’ to separate from the General Body of Protestant Dissenting Ministers. So far with the Presbyterians there is no dispute. With *their* opinions and feelings they acted wisely and honorably in seceding. Who would associate with covenant-breakers? What honest Presbyterian would not have renounced these perfidious Independents and treacherous Baptists? We protest against being understood to complain of their secession. We cordially say, *vale, vale, aeternumque vale.*

But the Presbyterians, not content with their own secession, have resolved, ‘that we do again declare, in the face of the world, that the Union of the Three Denominations of Protestant Dissenting Ministers is dissolved, and has been dissolved ‘from the period of our withdrawalment.’ On the other hand, the General Body resolved, though not ‘in the face of the world,’ which, having just now much else to think about, is supposed to take but little interest in such matters, ‘that the recent withdrawalment of certain Unitarian members of the Presbyterian body from the General Union, has not affected, and does not ‘affect the existence, constitution, and objects of the Union.’

The precise question between the two parties, and we wish to discuss it divested of all extraneous matter, is, What influence has the vote of the Presbyterian Body upon the constitution or existence of the General Body? We might ask, By whom can the question of the dissolution of any Society be better determined than by its own members? All the members of the General Body, or of the late General Body, were regularly summoned to consider that question, and the resolutions of the 18th of April, 1836, are the result. Other persons may declare the



General Body dissolved, but, while the majority of its members assert its existence, we shall regard its dissolution as we do 'the case' of the great Mr. Partridge, of Dublin, who, contrary to his own remonstrance, was pronounced dead by a jury of his countrymen.

We imagine, that no Society in the world can be dissolved without its own privity or consent, by the act of a minority of its members. But we are quite willing to leave this *à priori* argument, and fairly to meet the Presbyterians upon their own ground—the peculiar constitution of the General Body of Protestant Dissenting Ministers. It will, on such reference, be evident, that the members of the Presbyterian Body, voting 'agreeably to the forms and usages observed by the Body from the period of its incorporation,' whenever that may have been, were, in the simplicity of their hearts, thus solemnly, deliberately, and according to ancient usage, excommunicating themselves.

The argument, or rather the assumption, of the Presbyterians is, that the General Body was originally constituted by the several and distinct acts of the Three Bodies of Presbyterians, Independents, and Anti-pædobaptists; so that its constituent parts are not individuals, but subordinate bodies, united by an explicit or understood compact. Our position, on the contrary, is, that the General Body was constituted by the members of the several denominations without any act or vote of their respective bodies, so that the constituent parts are individuals belonging to the subordinate bodies, but not the bodies themselves. If our position be correct, then each separate body is no part of the Union itself, but only a part of the machinery, by which it operates in the admission of its members and appointment of its Committee—and the United Body of Dissenting members can be no more affected by any vote of the Presbyterian denomination, than the United Service Club could be affected by a vote of the majority of its military or of its naval members, taken separately. As in the United Service, either the soldiers or the sailors separately, so in the United denominations, the Presbyterians, Independents, or Baptists, separately, if interfering with the General Association, of whose name and privileges they are only co-partners, become a cabal, not a community, engaged in an intrigue, not transacting their own business. Tenants in common, they cannot damnify the estate, should they determine to disclaim their own rights.

To controvert the position of the Unitarians, and confirm our own, we beg attention to the following remarks. The discussion may prove dry and technical, yet we think it not unimportant.

I. The name of the Association is '*The General Body of Dissenting Ministers of the Three Denominations in and about the Cities of London and Westminster.*' Unless this title be a gross

misnomer, the Union is composed of Dissenting Ministers, and not of Dissenting Societies. There is not the slightest intimation of United Bodies, in this Union of individuals. According to the Presbyterian hypothesis, the proper title would have been, 'The General Union of the Three Bodies of Dissenting Ministers.' With as good grace may the ministers of Westminster secede *in a body* from their brethren of London, as the ministers of one denomination from the other two.

2. The regulations agreed upon at the formation of the General Body, clearly imply a Union of persons, and not of distinct organized bodies.

As both parties admit, the Dissenting ministers in and about London were constituted into a permanent and regular Association, at a meeting held at the George, in Ironmonger Lane, on the 11th of July, 1727. The official record of the proceedings still remains, both in the Minutes of the General Body, and prefixed to those of the Congregational Board. The original regulations adopted at this meeting were, first, 'That no person should be allowed to join the General Body in its public acts, besides such as were approved by one or other of the Three Denominations.' Secondly, 'That all who were, or afterwards should be, approved by the Denomination to which they belonged, should be allowed to sit and vote at the meetings of the Body of the Three Denominations.' Thirdly, 'That all ministers falling under these classes, who should reside within ten miles of London and Westminster, should be eligible to the Union.'

If the General Body were not, what its name imports, a Union of Dissenting Ministers, but a Union of Dissenting Bodies previously organized, what can have been the object, reason, propriety, or use, of declaring who should be *allowed to join it*. If, instead of a new Society having been formed, three ancient Bodies had been united, each member of any Body separate would have remained a member of the same Body in Union, and it would have been absurd to declare that he should be allowed to join it. According to the Presbyterian comment, the meaning of these regulations is, that all the members of the Three Denominations shall be allowed to belong to them. This is called 'their adherence to the fundamental constitution of the original Union.'

According to the third regulation, if a minister should have fallen under the right class, that is, should have been approved by his own denomination, and yet should not at the time have been residing within the prescribed distance, he would not have been eligible to the Union. But one approved member of any particular Body, ineligible to the General Union, is fatal to 'the case of the Presbyterians.' If it be said that each Body, by

some fixed and immutable law of its constitution, was not able to expand itself beyond the prescribed limits, then the third regulation, by declaring ineligible a class that could by no possibility come into existence, must have been as absurd and impertinent as the other two. Upon our theory these regulations are exceedingly proper. Who could have been so competent as the members of his own denomination, to decide upon the claims of a minister to the character which he assumed? What Baptist or Independent, for instance, could, or can now, say what constitutes a modern English Presbyterian? Who but a brother can vouch for Presbyterian orthodoxy? Who else could know that Baxter and Belsham were of the same sect? We have indeed read in a Unitarian publication, that Presbyterians are people who 'have come down in regular succession from their ancestors,' that is, as we suppose, who have held fast by ancient endowments. The determination, however, of such questions is wisely left to the appropriate denomination.

3. On the admission of a minister into any particular Body, he does not immediately, and *ipso facto*, become a member of the General Body. By invariable practice no one is admitted to the General Body until his name has been reported at an annual meeting. He may have been eleven months a member of his own Body, before he is received into the General Association. If it be said such a person is not known as an accepted and approved minister until thus reported, we reply, that were he truly a member, better care would have been taken to communicate timely and official information to the General Secretary, that every member might be duly summoned to an Extraordinary Meeting, should such take place previous to the next ensuing Annual Meeting. If the General Body be a Union of the three subordinate Bodies, many of its meetings have been informal; because many of its members have not been summoned to attend them. There have been excluded all ministers, who have been received into their particular denominations subsequent to the next preceding Annual Meeting of the General Body.

4. The members of the General Body, and the members of the three particular Bodies, taken together, are not identical. The lists by no means correspond. In both the Baptist and Congregational Boards, ministers have been accepted and approved, who have never been proposed to the General Body. In several instances, seceders from the General Body have long remained, and still remain, accredited members of their several denominations; and their names have been erased from the one list while they have been retained on the other. If the three organized denominational Bodies were its essential and constituent parts, the General Body has been these many years dissolved, for there has not been any meeting to which all its mem-



bers have been summoned. Whatever, or wherever, the General Body may have been, the meetings usually held in Red-Cross Street have been the meetings of a Society, to which have belonged only some of the approved ministers of the three nominations.

5. The business of the General Body has always been conducted upon the assumption of its being composed of individuals, and not of communities. Its expenses are assessed *per capita*. Its officers are elected, its measures decided, and its votes determined by an enumeration of individuals. Had three Bodies united, each ought to have been charged with one-third of the general expense. When the Baptists and Independents had paid individually a year in advance for the pleasure and comfort of Presbyterian communion and counsel, were they to be told, that a monopolizing minority could dissolve the connexion in an hour? Though the money was a trifle, yet a principle of honour was involved, which ought to have protected inviolate the integrity of the Society.

In the ordinary business of the General Body, the only apparent deviation from the mode of procedure here maintained, is in the election of its Committee. Each denomination separately elects its proportion. This, however, was provided, as a matter of convenience, by a direct vote, which, when examined, confirms the views we have taken. At the meeting of the General Body, next after the lists of the several denominations were completed, according to the regulations of the pastors who had determined upon the Union, held at Salters' Hall, September 17, 1728, it was agreed, 'That the annual choice of the Committee be made upon a summons from the Committee then subsisting to the three denominations distinctly, without giving the General Body any unnecessary trouble as to that affair.' 'According to the agreement foregoing, the Body of the Congregational Ministers were summoned, and met accordingly, at Mr. Asty's Meeting-place, at three o'clock, afternoon, October 1st, 1728. Mr. Ridgeley, in the chair, declared that the *General Body had appointed* new Committees of each denomination to be chosen, and accordingly, we were now met to choose a Committee of the Congregational Body.\* It was usual in the early history of the General Body to fix the day on which the separate denominations should meet to choose their proportions of the Committee. Thus, at a meeting of the General Committee at North's Coffee House, January 6, 1728—9, Dr. Watts in the chair, agreed, 'That the summons appointed to be sent to the several denominations, in order to the choice of the Committee for the ensuing year, be made for Monday, August 4, 1729.' 'The

---

\* Minutes of Congregational Board, including some Minutes of the General Body.

‘Dissenting ministers of the Congregational denomination met according to this summons at Blackwell’s Coffee House, Aug. 4, 1729,’ and ballotted for their Committee. It thus appears that, originally, the General Body fixed and summoned meetings of the denominations separately; and made use of them as a part of its machinery. There is also another record of the meeting of January 6, 1728—9, which shows the power of the General Body, and even of its Committee, to correct and regulate the lists of its members, independently of the particular denominations. ‘It was also agreed, by the common opinion of all present, though not by a formal vote, that when persons on the list were dead, or had left the Dissenters entirely, or were settled above ten miles from London, there was no need of a vote of their denomination to leave them out of the list, but the Committee might do it; but when any new members were to be added to the list, it was doubted and queried whether it could be done by any particular Committee, [or by the General Committee, and whether it did not require a vote of the Body.] Could there have been a doubt or query upon the subject, if the General Body were merely a Union of three distinct and organized Societies?’

6. The assertion of the Presbyterians, ‘that the Three Bodies of Protestant Dissenting Ministers formed themselves into a United Body,’ is, if intended in their corporate capacity, contradicted by facts and existing records.

‘With the history and the records of one of the denominations, the compilers of the case profess to be somewhat intimately acquainted.’ Can they produce any resolution by which the Presbyterians, *as a body*, determined to join the other two denominations, previous to the 11th of July, 1727? Had they possessed any thing to sustain their allegation, ‘the compilers of the case’ would undoubtedly have produced it. The recent secession of the Presbyterians as a Body, is assuredly recorded on their Minutes: but, where is the correspondent voucher for their preceding act of Union?

The Baptist members of the General Body did not at that time constitute, nor have they at any period since constituted, nor do they now constitute, an organized Body *distinct from the General Union* of the Three Denominations. There has been, and is, a Board of Particular Baptist Ministers, but from this the General Baptists are of course excluded. There has been also, under some name, an Association of the General Baptist Ministers in and about London; but there is no organized Body including both parties. If there be, what is it called? Where does it meet? Who are its officers? Where are its minutes? It is quite true, as the compilers of ‘the case’ state, that the General Baptists ‘have always constituted a portion of the Body of London Baptist Ministers *belonging to the General Body.*’

But it is equally true that, distinct from the General Body, the two classes of Baptists have no connexion whatever. The Secretary of the Baptist Board may report the ministers accepted and approved by the General Baptists; but still he is not their officer, as they have no vote whatever in his election. The proportion of the Committee of the Three Denominations representing the Baptists, is elected in two parts by two distinct and separate Societies, each having a voice only in the choice of its own representation. The Annual Report of the Baptists is, in fact, always two Reports, combined in the General Committee; for the two classes of Baptists *have no Union whatever elsewhere*. The Presbyterians have their meetings; the Congregationalists have theirs; the Baptists, *as such*, have none. What sort of a Body can that be which has no officers, no minutes, no regulations, and which for more than a century has held no meetings? The Baptist ministers are in no sense one Body. As Baptist ministers they are two Bodies, and not one. As Dissenting ministers they are a part of a Body, and not the whole.

Had the Baptists been disposed to play the same pranks as their Presbyterian brethren, they would have been at some loss for appropriate language. They certainly could not have spoken of themselves as a Body, 'by its constitution entire and independent,' nor have done any thing, 'agreeably to the forms and usages which have been observed by their Body from the period of its incorporation.' The Presbyterians, though a diminutive minority, have a monopoly of such privileges.

'The case' writers observe that, until the accession of George I., 'the Calvinistic Baptists were the only portion of that denomination who had been admitted into association with the Presbyterians and Congregationalists in their public acts.' The correctness of this assertion we may hereafter examine. It is, however, certain that, of a standing Committee of the ministers of the Three Denominations in the reign of Queen Anne, the Baptist part was elected by the Calvinists only, on which account they had been subject to the complaints of their Arminian brethren. It is added, 'the justice of this complaint was at once admitted by the Particular Baptists, and an amicable arrangement was in consequence made, on the re-appointment of the General Committee, to receive the General Baptists into the Union, and to give them a voice in the election. From this time they have always constituted a portion of the Body of London Baptist ministers belonging to the General Body.' This is, in the main, true; but if it be inferred, that from this time the Calvinists and Arminians have constituted a permanent Body, the inference must be corrected. Such a Union was then attempted, but as Crosby himself, the authority to which the Presbyterians refer, observes, 'this laudable and good design soon



‘dwindled and came to nothing.’ \* This brief Union in 1714, does not, in the least degree, affect our proposition, that from 1727, the year in which was formed the permanent Union of the London Dissenting Ministers, the General and Particular Baptists have never constituted a distinct Body.

The Society, since called the Baptist Board, is undoubtedly very ancient. It originally consisted of only a part of even the Particular Baptist Ministers of London, who, as a Friendly Association, met weekly at the Hanover, afterwards at the Gloucestershire Coffee House. It seems to have sustained some modification about 1723, when its present minutes commence, and to have obtained the name of the Baptist Board, about the time when the General Body was formed. Crosby, writing a few years afterwards, calls it ‘a small Society of Baptist Ministers;’ and says, ‘it is but of late years they have been rendered contemptible with the name of the Baptist Board, which they obtained under their present head.’ †

Previously to the formation of the General Body, it consisted of only about a dozen members. On the first meeting of the General Committee, the list of Baptist ministers in and about London was given in, as it included the members of this Society, some Particular Baptists not members of this Society, and the General Baptists. Until that meeting of Committee on November 7, 1727, four months after the formation of the General Body, these various Baptists, being, according to the author of ‘The London Manuscript,’ of four sorts, Antinomians, Calvinists, Socinians, and Arminians, constituted no United Body or Society whatsoever. ‡ If any further evidence were necessary to prove that about this period the Baptist ministers did not constitute one Board, we could supply it *ex abundantia*. As, for instance, in 1731, according to a manuscript in our possession, sustained by the Baptist minutes, when Dr. Williams’ trustees, after the completion of the library by contributions from members of all the denominations, sent notice to the Society already referred to, that ‘the use and perusal of the library was permitted to all the pastors of their denomination,’ the list made out by

\* Crosby’s English Baptists, Vol. IV., p. 109.

† Crosby’s English Baptists, Vol. III., p. 288. They certainly had the name in 1731, four years after the formation of the General Body. See Letters of Dr. Sayer Rudd, who was expelled the Baptist Board.

‡ These particulars may be ascertained by a comparison of Crosby, the Minutes of the Baptist Board, the Minutes of the Congregational Board, and what has been called ‘The London Manuscript,’ a curious document, giving an account of the London Dissenting interest from 1695 to 1731, by a hearer of Dr. Doddridge. The copy examined by the writer, was transcribed by Walter Wilson, Esq., from the original, in the possession of the Rev. S. Palmer.

that Society or Baptist Board being necessarily defective, 'Dr. Gill was desired to see the General Baptists,' to effect its completion. We agree with the compilers of 'the case' that, in the Minutes of the early meeting of the General Committee, nothing is said of a Board or of a Body. The record is exact: 'Mr. Burroughs delivered in a list of the pastors and approved ministers of the Anti-pædobaptist denomination.' Mr. Burroughs was himself, not a member of the Baptist Board, but a General Baptist.

If the evidence furnished by the Baptist denomination, in determining the constitution of the general body, is satisfactory, that supplied by the Congregational is, if possible, much more so. The ministers of the three denominations have stated, in their third resolution, that 'the Ministers formed themselves into separate and distinct bodies; and that 'the first general meeting, after the separate bodies were organised, was held on the 11th of July, 1727.' We suppose the allusion is to the forming of the several lists of ministers, of the three denominations residing within ten miles of the cities of London and Westminster; but, if it be, the date is incorrect, as these lists were presented to the General Committee, those of the Presbyterians and Baptists in November 7, 1727, and that of the Congregationalists on January 8, 1728. To the parties, whose names were in these lists, have been always left the accepting and approving of the ministers of their several denominations. 'Thus introduced to the general body, 'the ministers have severally continued members during life; 'unless they violated the standing laws of the Union, were officially notified as no longer members of the bodies to which they 'respectively belonged, voluntarily withdrew from the Union, 'or were excluded by a vote of the general body.'

Here the Presbyterians are more than usually confident and dogmatical. 'The compilers have said, that they have perused 'these averments with feelings of surprise; and for this reason, 'that they consider them to be, from first to last, unsupported by 'any adequate authority, printed, manuscript, or traditional.' Before the compilers refer us to traditional authority, they will have to read a great deal more of the evidence, both in print and in manuscript.

Had this surprise referred to the inaccurate date, we should have called the attention of the 'case' makers to many such errors of their own; as, for instance, to two on the very same page as that in which their surprise is expressed. On page 21, line 2, 'a meeting of the three denominations, held in September 'of the same year,' should be of the next year; and again, line 12, 'the month of September following should be the month of September in the following year. They have in both instances assigned to September 1727, the transactions of September 17, 1728.

But 'the compilers feel themselves entitled to demand the evidence of the fact, that the ministers, *now, or about this time*, formed themselves into separate and distinct bodies, under any form, or any designation, which had not pertained to them before.'—p. 22. Again, 'they think that they are in a condition to affirm, that there exists not, among the records of either the Congregational or Baptist Boards, any account of such a transaction.'—p. 23. How these gentlemen came to think themselves in such 'a condition' we cannot divine; but that the Congregational ministers, after long debate respecting 'the rule they should follow,' on December 5, 1727, determined upon the constitution of a society, to be called by the new designation of 'the third body,'—a designation which their Secretary, in his minutes, thought it necessary to explain, and to which were admitted, with the concurrence of the general committee, thirty-five, 'previously allowed to be of the Congregational body,' and fifteen others, is all most plainly and explicitly recorded in the minutes of the Congregational body. No evidence can be more satisfactory and complete, in proof of the new organization of the Congregationalists, upon a new principle, under a new designation, with new regulations and new members, than that which is furnished by their own minutes.

At the meeting, already so often noticed, held on July 11, 1727, it was agreed that a committee should be chosen from the three denominations. With this meeting the minutes of the Congregational body commence.

The next entry is 'in conformity to a vote, passed at a general meeting of the pastors of the three denominations, in and about London and Westminster, on July 11, 1727, the ministers of the Congregational denomination met upon a summons, on Monday, September 25, 1727, at Mr. Asty's Meeting Place, in Little Moorfields, and placed Mr. Asty in the chair; present thirty-four, besides the chair.' This was not a meeting of a previously organized body, or the first resolution would not have been declaratory of the persons having a right to vote. '1. Agreed that every one present, *who chooses to be reckoned among the Congregational Ministers*, and does not design to vote in and with the Presbyterian or Baptist Ministers, be allowed to vote at this meeting.' The privilege of voting was thus referred to the option of all present, there being, as we shall see, no list of Congregational Ministers. The persons present did no more than elect six members, as their quota of the general committee.

The General Committee held their first meeting at Founders' Hall, Tuesday, November 7, 'when it was desired that the particular committee of each denomination would give in a list of those who were allowed and approved as ministers of their denominations within ten miles of London and Westminster.'



These, as we suppose, are 'the separate and distinct bodies,' into which 'the ministers formed themselves,' according to the resolutions under discussion. It is recorded that 'the list of the approved ministers of the Presbyterian denomination, was delivered in by Mr. Evans, and received; that Mr. Burroughs gave in a list of the pastors and approved ministers of the Baptist denomination.' The compilers of the 'case' add as an extract, 'A list of the Congregational Ministers was brought in by their members of the Committee present, and was received.' This is stated so as to produce a wrong impression, as the Congregational list was not given in until a subsequent meeting of the General Committee. The true account is thus supplied from the Congregational minutes. 'The particular Committee for the Congregational Ministers, declared they had not yet determined their list, which they were desired to do as soon as possible, and bring it in, and make report of it to the General Committee, at their next meeting.' What sort of an organised body was that, of which no list of names could be furnished?

The Committee, not knowing how to frame their list, summoned their constituents to determine the question, who met Dec. 5th, 1727. At this meeting, if words have any meaning, the Congregational Body was organized; and, according to the plan adopted, the list was subsequently formed. We give the minutes without comment.

'According to this summons the body\* of the Congregational Ministers met at Mr. Watts's meeting-place, about three o'clock in the afternoon, to determine what rule they should act by in forming and adjusting the body of the Congregational Denomination, and to settle the list for time to come. Mr. Watts in the chair; present 30. All the minutes† of this book being first read over, and the design of this meeting being represented, there was a long debate about the rule or method by which the list of the Congregational ministers should be settled. The two most considerable opinions proposed and urged were these: viz. 1. That those only should be accounted Congregational Ministers who some way or other manifested their agreement to the Savoy Confession of Faith and Order of Congregational Churches. 2. That the rule by which the ministers were admitted to give their votes, Sept. 25, for the choice of the Committee, should be the rule by which the list of the Congregational Ministers should be determined and

---

\* This phrase seems to have been unusual, for there is a note in the original hand-writing to explain it. 'NOTE—by the whole body of Congregational Ministers is meant all those who chose to be reckoned among the Congregational Ministers, and did not design to meet and vote with the other two bodies of Presbyterians and Baptists, according to the agreement of September 25th.'

† An account of the formation and directions of the General Body.

settled, viz. those who had been known and approved preachers, and chose to be ranked among the Congregational Ministers, and did not design to vote in the body of the Presbyterian or Baptist Ministers.

‘After much time spent, and many arguments on both sides, it was agreed thus, *nemine contradicente*, viz. that the rule by which ministers were determined to have a vote for choosing the Committee of the Third Body of Protestant Dissenters, on Sept. 25th last, be followed in admitting any minister into the list of that Body to vote with it on political occasions for one year, i. e. till Michaelmas next.

‘NOTE.—It was called a *Third Body*, because some present were very zealous to exclude the name Congregational out of the whole question and vote, unless the first rule were followed, and the Congregational Ministers were distinguished by agreeing to the Savoy Confession. The night coming on, and the ministers withdrawing themselves by degrees, those of the other opinion permitted the question to be put in this form rather than break up the assembly and do nothing.

‘Upon this vote the assembly broke up, and did not stay to determine and settle the list according to this vote. But the vote itself being so plain, and so easy to be applied, it was thought by several of the Committee a needless thing to call the whole body together for this purpose. Accordingly there was a list drawn up, thirty-five of which were before allowed to be of the Congregational Body, viz. . . . .

‘— There are fifteen more that are sufficiently well known to be of the Congregational Body, or have explicitly declared they chose to be ranked among them, viz. . . . .’

The names of both classes are given, but the list of Ministers then arranged was *submitted to the vote* and approval of the Committee of the Three Denominations. At the Meeting of the General Committee at Founders’ Hall, January 8th, 1728, Mr. Ridgely, Mr. Lowman, and Mr. Watts ‘offered to the General Committee the list which was drawn up according to this rule, ‘which they themselves approved of, and desired to know of the ‘General Committee whether they did approve and accept this ‘list; which, *being put to the question*, the General Committee ‘did approve and accept, *nemine contradicente*.’

At the next meeting of the Congregational Body, October 1, 1728, ‘it was long debated,’ respecting the proper time of the admission of ‘some young ministers present, whose names were ‘not on the list, either not having been resident in London, or ‘not having begun to preach when the list was made.’

So, according to its own minutes, was organized the Congregational Body, though not originally under that designation. It was constituted in obedience to the direction of the General Body, upon a principle settled, after ‘much time spent, and many ‘arguments,’ with a new name, and eventually with the sanction of the General Committee. We ask the compilers of ‘the case’ whether they still think ‘that they are in a condition to affirm



‘that there exists not among the records of either the Congregational or Baptist boards any account of such a transaction.’ The account of such a transaction is the only important record in fifty years’ minutes.

But ‘with the history and records of one of the denominations, the compilers of this case profess to be somewhat intimately acquainted, and they can affirm that there is not a tittle of written or oral evidence of such an organization of the Presbyterian Body having been effected about this time.’ That among the records of the Presbyterians there is not a tittle of *oral* evidence, we can easily believe; for the rest we should like to investigate the matter for ourselves. As, however, with the vision of the Presbyterian records, our eyes never have been, and, in all probability, never will be refreshed; and withal having before us a wholesome fear of the ‘condition’ of these ‘case’ makers, we shall affirm nothing whatever. Their intimate acquaintance with the history of their own denomination, if the patience of our readers be not utterly exhausted, we propose to examine. In the meanwhile we ask them to consider the reasons we have assigned, and the evidence we have adduced in contravention of the main position of the Presbyterians, that the General Body was constituted by the Union of three previously distinct and independent Bodies. Our argument is that the General Body was constituted July 11, 1727, by the ministers of the three denominations, when two of the three bodies were not in existence, and the third, allowing for the present that it sustained at that period no important modification, has produced no record of any act, by which, *in its corporate capacity*, it formed a union with the two parties and odd pieces of the Baptists, and the Congregationalists, and Nondescripts subsequently combined into ‘the Third Body.’ We admit that this statement is not in exact accordance with the resolutions of either party. We are sorry for this circumstance, although our business is not to defend the resolutions, but to vindicate the integrity of the General Body.

The Presbyterians endeavour to establish the contrary positions, not by a reference to any usages or records of the body, but by a process of historical inquiry into the state of the several denominations previous to their permanent union in 1727. The application of their deductions, even on the admission of their correctness, is not very obvious. Admitting, as they contend, that, in the early history of Nonconformity, the ministers of the three denominations constituted several distinct and accredited organized bodies, what avails the admission unless it can be shown that not the several members of these bodies, individually, but the several bodies acting in their corporate capacity, constituted the General Body? For the evidence of such a union we have already called, and, as we cannot be expected to prove a nega-



tive, we may safely leave the question until the evidence demanded be produced. We think, however, we have shown that such a coalition of communities was at the time impracticable, and, for once, by the aid of Aristotle, we may even prove our negative, since that great authority assures us, that what is impossible has never taken place.

The resolutions of the orthodox party, we use that term for convenience, refer to the usages of Dissenters from the Act of Uniformity. This seems to us a beginning at the beginning. In controversy it is often prudent and politic to discuss matters remotely connected with the subject. The Unitarians, determining not to be counterchecked by such a manœuvre, have gone back to the restoration of Charles II. 'It will be necessary to look 'back through the two preceding years.' We do not exactly see the necessity of this retrograde motion, in order to ascertain whether or not the General Body of Dissenting Ministers was dissolved on the 4th of March, 1836. The Presbyterians, however, have the undoubted right to conduct their own 'case' in their own way; and, if they had said that it would 'be necessary' to retreat, not to the commonwealth, but to the creation, we must have followed them, though with the suspicion that arguments were somewhat scarce when gentlemen had wandered so far in search of them.

Let us hear their statement, respecting the period which elapsed between the Restoration and the passing of the Act of Uniformity.

'It is well known that the Presbyterian Ministers formed at this time a numerous body of men, eminent both as scholars and divines, holding the best church livings in the Metropolis, firmly united together as a social community by common principles and common interests, and meeting statedly at Sion College, for the transaction of such business as related to them in their corporate and collective capacity. In the public transactions of that eventful period they acted a conspicuous part as a known and recognized body, assuming the same functions, and admitted to the same privileges as the Episcopal Clergy. At the time the two Houses of Parliament were negotiating for the return of Charles II., the Presbyterian Ministers of London sent a deputation to Breda to treat with the king on ecclesiastical matters. The deputation were admitted to a personal interview, delivered an address on behalf of their body, and received the King's personal reply. Subsequently to the King's return to England, and after he had pronounced the declaration of Oct. 25, 1660, the Presbyterian Ministers went up to court in their associated capacity with an address, which was delivered to the King, who gave them, as before, his personal answer. The manner and form of proceeding in the presentation of this address were, as far as appears, in every respect the same as have in later times been observed on occasion of the General Body of the Three Denominations going to court. Nor is it unimportant to add

that the Body of Presbyterian Ministers were fully recognized in the arrangements for the Savoy Conference, in which they were represented by Deputies, as one of the public Bodies whose cause was then to be solemnly argued and determined. From these facts it is apparent that the Presbyterian Ministers in London were at this period an united and organized body, recognized by the government and the court, and enjoying the privilege of presenting petitions and addresses to the sovereign in the royal presence.

Of this paragraph we have to say, that the facts are incorrectly stated; that the reasoning founded upon them is inconclusive; and that both facts and reasoning, even if shown to be incontrovertible, are totally inapplicable to the question under discussion—all which we will endeavour to make out to the satisfaction of our Presbyterian friends.

As to the stated meetings at Zion College, there were two recognized Bodies which were accustomed to hold their regular meetings within that building. The one, the London Provincial Assembly, being an Ecclesiastical Body, constructed upon a Presbyterian model, though in many particulars sorely against the wishes of the Presbyterian Clergy, was undoubtedly an acknowledged and duly organized Presbyterian Body; but this Body was composed of laity as well as clergy, in the proportion of two ruling elders to one minister. The other, the London Clergy, held its meetings weekly before the restoration, and very frequently afterwards; but then this was recognized and accredited as the Body of the London Clergy, at the restoration for the most part Presbyterian, but not exclusively so, nor in that character organized. To illustrate this we ask, were not Mr. Caryl, of St. Magnus, 'a moderate independent,' and that 'principal man in managing the Meeting of the Congregational Churches at the Savoy,' as Calamy calls Mr. Philip Nye, of St. Bartholomew, behind the Exchange, as much members of the London Clergy Meeting at Zion College, as Mr. Calamy, Dr. Manton, or the best Presbyterian among them. It is true, that Presbyterian ministers held 'the best church-livings in the metropolis;' yet, notwithstanding their good care of themselves, the incumbents of the poorer benefices were a part of the London Ministers. Though Presbyterian counsels and influence ruled in Zion College for a time, and several leading Presbyterians were accustomed to meet together for conference and business, yet the Presbyterian Ministers were not organized as a body in contradistinction from their brethren. Calamy says, May 7, 1661, 'There was a Meeting at Zion College of the Ministers of London for the choice of a president and assistants for the next year. Some of the Presbyterians, upon a pettish scruple, absenting themselves, the Diocesan party carried it, and got the

‘possession and rule of the College.’\* Is it affirmed, in the face of such facts, that the ministers of London, who had the right to meet at Zion College before the act of uniformity, did not comprize the Diocesan party?†

As to the deputation to Breda, though the ministers were looked upon as the ‘most able assertors of Presbyterian opinions,’‡ yet they acted for the London Ministers as such, and most of them, among whom was Mr. Bowles, not of London, but of York, received their commission from the Convention.§ Baxter says, || ‘Certain divines were sent by the parliament and city into Holland, and some went voluntarily.’ Whoever sent them, they declared themselves ‘no enemies of moderate episcopacy.’ The compilers of ‘the case,’ where Neal says ‘the *London Ministers*’ unfairly cite his authority for their own phrase, ‘the *Presbyterian Ministers of London*.’

The next misrepresentation is still more inexcusable: ‘The *Presbyterian Ministers* went up to Court *in their associated capacity* with an address.’ The address is preserved by Baxter¶, not as in Neal, without its title, but complete, as ‘Printed by his Majesty’s Approbation, for John Rothwell, at the sign of the *Fountain*, in Cheapside, in Goldsmith’s Row, 1660.’ It is entitled, ‘To the King’s most Excellent Majesty, The humble and grateful acknowledgment of *many ministers of the Gospel* in and about the city of London.’ The names of the ministers were subscribed. The style and title of this address are in direct contradiction to the assertion of the compilers of ‘the case.’ Though some Presbyterian Ministers presented it, yet they presented it most certainly not in any ‘*associated capacity*,’ but individually as ‘*many ministers of the Gospel*.’ Of the proceedings of the London Ministers at the Restoration, Baxter says, ‘I leave it here on record that to the best of my knowledge, the Presbyterian cause was never spoken for, nor were they ever heard to petition for it at all:’ and again, ‘I drew up an enumeration of abundance of particulars, which we never pleaded for, which the Presbyterians usually hold, and showed that we never meddled with their proper cause, partly because we were not all of a mind ourselves in every small matter.’\*\*

\* Calamy’s Baxter, i. 159.

† Some Presbyterian Committees, including the leading ministers of the Committee for ordaining ministers after the Presbyterian way, were accustomed, previous to the restoration, to meet in Zion College, as were, for some time, King Charles’s Presbyterian Chaplains.

‡ King’s Declaration, Oct. 25, 1660.

|| Baxter’s Life, part ii. p. 218.

\*\* Life, part ii. p. 278.

§ Oldmixon, i. p. 466.

¶ Life, part ii. p. 284.



But the account of the Savoy conference is the most extraordinary part of this extraordinary paragraph. What connexion had it with the people puritanic or prelati- cal of London, other than with those of the country generally? We need not cite authorities, for all historians, civil and ecclesiastical, agree, and every body knows that among the puritanic divines of the Savoy conference, were the Bishop of Norwich, the Regius Professor and Savilian Professor of Oxford, the Master of St. John's, Cambridge, and the parson of Dedham, in Suffolk; that the ministers, instead of being *deputies* of their brethren, derived their authority from the king's commission; that Dr. Reynolds and Mr. Calamy alone had the nomination; and that so far from representing any body of ministers, they, according to Neal, expressly complained that they had no power to act for others, and desired, but were refused, to receive authority on behalf of their brethren.

Such are the facts, every one of which is misrepresented in the paragraph we have quoted. Let us attend to the reasoning: 'From these facts it is apparent;' that is, because the Presbyterian Ministers frequented Zion College; because some of them went to Breda to tell Charles they were no enemies to episcopacy; because '*many* ministers of the Gospel' made an address to the king; and because the Bishop of Norwich, some professors from Oxford and Cambridge, with certain others, were commissioned to consult upon ecclesiastical matters: 'It is apparent that *the Presbyterian Ministers of London* were, at this period, an united and organized body, recognized by the government and the court.' How much would the argumentations of the Savoy disputants have been facilitated, had they been blessed with the logic of modern Presbyterians!

But even if the facts and reasoning were both incontrovertible, they have no connexion whatever with the question under discussion. Is it pretended that the Presbyterian Body, from which 'the case' has emanated, is the identical Body assumed to have been organized in Zion College before the restoration, and so entitled by uninterrupted succession to its privileges? It is indeed stated, that the act of uniformity 'made no alteration in their internal constitution and arrangements as a social community;' that 'the social constitution and privileges of the Presbyterian Body remained unchanged in the reign of James II.; that in the reign of William it did not lose its separate existence and identity.' In this 'historical inquiry,' it is gravely contended that the city ministers of the Commonwealth, whose fulminations once made sectaries and heretics tremble, who frightened Cromweil, cajoled Monk, and in their Geneva cloaks and the simplicity of their loyal hearts presented Charles with the Bible, are still perpetuated in their proper and reverend body, reduced

indeed by time, and sadly diminished by the intellect or economy of this age, whose expedients and contrivances have comfortably accommodated, without much crowding, in two meeting-houses, all the English Presbyterian people of the city of London. But if the Presbyterian Body be what it professes to be, the ancient body of city ministers of the interregnum, then we earnestly entreat its members, for the sake of their own character, to rescind a testimony which in their corporate capacity is theirs, if their argument be good—the testimony of the city ministers, dated Zion College, Dec. 14, 1647, against ‘Arianism, Socinianism, ‘Ana-baptism,’ &c., as ‘damnable errors, ‘horrid blasphemies,’ ‘the dregs and spawn of old cursed heresies, dead, buried, rotten ‘in their graves, now raked up to poison thousands;’ and *the toleration of them*, as denying ‘the very principles of Christianity ‘and civility.’ The Presbyterian Body may be fairly called upon either gravely to rescind this testimony, or to desist from declaring themselves to be the identical body by which it was published, or to sustain the reputation of being the most intolerantly orthodox people in the three kingdoms.

The account of the Presbyterian Ministers from the act of Uniformity to the death of Charles II., is in every particular equally inaccurate.

‘Within a few days after the act of Uniformity came into operation, the Body of Presbyterian Ministers, *meeting and acting in the same organized form as before*, went up to Court with a supplementary address to the King, praying for some mitigation of the statute which might enable them to continue their ministerial labours. Not long after, upon an intimation from Court that it was wished by the King to afford the non-conformists relief, they again appeared in the royal presence with an address, which was presented in the usual form. And still later, after the publication of the King’s Declaration of indulgence, they once more appeared at Court, and presented, in the customary manner, another address, to which, as in the preceding instances, the king delivered his personal reply.’—p. 10.

This is a very incomplete account of the interviews which the non-conformist ministers had with Charles II. That they ever presented an address as from an organized Presbyterian Body in a formal and public manner, is in ‘the case’ no where proved, though every where implied. The first address here mentioned was presented on the third day after the passing of the act of Uniformity, which, we are told, ‘made no alteration in the ‘internal condition’ of the Presbyterian Ministers. But Baxter says, ‘the conformists were of three sects: 1. Some of the old ‘ministers called Presbyterians formerly, who subscribed to the ‘parliament words, and put their own sense upon them by word

‘of mouth.’\* Were these conforming Presbyterians, as Baxter calls them, parties to the address of ‘some of the ministers likely to be cast out of all public service,’ or if they were not, the Presbyterian Body must have been re-organized, so as to exclude conformists, and that in the space of three days to have been in a condition to address the king as a Body of silenced ministers. This circumstance alone is sufficient to show that this ancient Presbyterian Body is but a phantasm of modern Presbyterian brains. The address, moreover, is unfortunately preserved by Calamy.† It is entitled, ‘To the King’s most Excellent Majesty, The humble petition of *several ministers* in your City of London:’ nor is there in it any mention of a Presbyterian Body at all. Is it not shamefully careless, or something worse, in order to get up a ‘case,’ to call a petition avowedly from several individuals, the address of an organized body?

The next address here specified is, as appears from the reference to Neal, that which, on Sir J. Baber’s suggestion, Drs. Manton, Jacomb, and Bates, presented to the king at Lord Arlington’s lodgings. We maintain this, like the preceding, was the address of the individuals whose names were subscribed to it, and not of any recognized Body. It is said ‘to have been presented in the usual form.’ It was presented *privately* at the house of a Popish nobleman, was never publicly announced, was answered by his Majesty in a long discussion about preaching in a play-house—‘the rattle-attle of the people,’ and other matters, all which ended with Arlington’s pulling the king’s coat. The best account of this *private* meeting of the king may be seen in a letter of Dr. Manton to Mr. Baxter. If this address be good for any thing in the argument, we must acknowledge ‘the case’ compilers have not done justice to their cause; for there were often such meetings with royalty. Baxter says‡, ‘The ministers in *several parties* were oft encouraged to make their addresses to the king. Sir J. Baber introduced Dr. Manton, and some with him; Mr. Ennis, a Scotch non-conformist, by Sir Robert Murray, introduced Mr. Whittaker, Dr. Annersley, Mr. Watson, and Mr. Vincent’s.’ The compilers of ‘the case,’ however, seem to know better than Mr. Baxter, as they tell us that ministers were accustomed to wait on the king as an organized Body, and not ‘in several parties.’

But on the Declaration of Indulgence another address was ‘presented in the customary manner.’ Posterity will hence discover how Presbyterians are accustomed to address their Sovereign. Baxter says§, ‘When they could not come to an

\* Baxter’s Life, part ii. p. 386.

† Life, part iii. p. 87.

‡ Continuation, vol. iii. p. 10.

§ Life, part iii. p. 99.



‘agreement about their form, the Lord Arlington introduced them to a *verbal extemporate thanksgiving*, and so their difference was ended as to that.’

We must here be allowed to ask by what right the Presbyterians claim this ‘cautelous and moderate thanksgiving,’ as Baxter calls it. The reference is to Neal, but he, without mentioning Presbyterians, merely speaks of the address as conveying the thanks of the non-conformists for their liberty. Baxter says there was a meeting of the ‘London Non-conformable Ministers.’ At this time the Presbyterians, Independents, and those whom Baxter calls ‘the Episcopal Non-conformists,’ acted together under the general name of non-conformists, as is evident from their immediately ‘setting up a weekly lecture to testify their ‘union’ at Pinners’ Hall. As such the ministers of the two parties seem to have united in offering their acknowledgments to the king. According to his biographer, Dr. Owen presented this address to the Sovereign.\* The concurrence of both parties in public measures, both before and soon after the Declaration of Indulgence; every circumstance connected with the address and allusion to it with which we are acquainted, except an incidental expression of Crosby, which we are prepared to explain; the probability that Owen presented the address, confirmed by an expression of his own in his preface to the answer to Stillingfleet, in which, speaking of ‘our thankful acceptance of the indulgence,’ he says, ‘I know myself herein peculiarly reflected on;’ and the absence of any acknowledgment from the Independents themselves, though they were generally less scrupulous than their brethren about the acceptance of the royal permission, compel us to consider as worthless, an unsupported assertion of the compilers of ‘the case,’ or rather an assertion speciously and fraudulently supported by a reference, which determines nothing whatever on either side of the question.

The next address adduced is that presented to James II. on occasion of his Declaration for Liberty of Conscience. At a meeting of Dissenting Ministers, it was determined ‘by a ma-

---

\* It will be observed that we do not venture to assert that this address was the production of Dr. Owen, though, if it be genuine, as printed in an early number of the Gentleman’s Magazine, the phraseology, in Owen always distinguishable, strikingly corroborates the authority of the original voucher, and unhesitating opinion of the Biographer. Mr. Orme thinks that Baxter was mistaken in supposing the address to have been spoken extempore. It is not, however, likely that Baxter, living at the time no farther from London than Totteridge, could have been mistaken. It is possible that Owen afterwards committed to writing his address to the king. His acknowledged ease and self-command in extemporaneous speaking, would have recommended him for his delicate and ‘cautelous’ service. See Orme’s Life of Owen, p. 272.

'jority,' say the compilers of 'the case;' as 'their common sense,' says Dr. Calamy, in his life of Howe, not to present any address. This circumstance shows that the Independents and Presbyterians acted together on public occasions previous to the revolution. Notwithstanding this decision, two several addresses were presented to the king: the one prepared, as is generally believed, by Vincent Alsop, who was under strong obligations to James, and signed by certain Presbyterians; the other presented by that Congregational Jacobite, Stephen Lobb, of Fetter Lane, for the Independents. These are represented as the addresses of the collective Bodies, though Calamy says of the dissenting ministers that 'the far greater number stood it out,' that is, would not concur in any address. There is not the shadow of evidence adduced that the ministers of either Body met and acted as a community on this occasion. The compilers say of Alsop's address, 'it was presented in the name and as the 'address of the Body of Presbyterian Ministers.' They should have examined the address itself before they ventured to describe it. It is, as preserved in the *Biographia Britannica*, article Alsop, entitled, 'The Humble Address of the Presbyterians;' there is not one word about the ministers of the Presbyterian Body of London, or indeed about any ministers at all. It is 'subscribed on behalf of ourselves and the rest of our persuasion.' Who may have been meant by 'the Presbyterians' may be a question, but what right has any one to say an address so entitled was presented 'in the name of the Body of Presbyterian 'Ministers' of London?

The result of an examination of *all the instances* adduced to prove that the Presbyterian Ministers of London acted on public occasions as an organized Body, and were recognized in their corporate capacity, is that on no public or political occasion whatever have the Presbyterian Ministers acted together in any corporate capacity, disunited from the other non-conformists. We have seen addresses from 'several ministers of London,' from Presbyterian Ministers in small parties, from non-conformist Ministers generally, and from 'the Presbyterians,' in opposition to the wishes of the majority of their ministers. As from the revolution the two denominations avowedly and notoriously acted together on public occasions, there is not a record, at least there is not produced a single instance of any address to the throne presented by the Body of London Presbyterian Ministers since the act of Uniformity. We know this is cutting up the Presbyterian 'case' by the root, but we cannot help ourselves. Such a pamphlet as theirs was not made for criticism. It seems to have been published on the presumption that nobody would take the trouble to examine it.

It is a part of 'the case,' that the Independent and Baptist

Ministers of London, constituted, in the reign of Charles II. and of his brother, organized Bodies, distinct from each other and from the Presbyterians, and severally endowed with peculiar privileges. We shall merely mention the facts on which this presumption is founded, and leave our readers to form their own conclusion. Because, on the restoration, 'Lord Clarendon produced a paper, being a sort of petition from the Independents and Baptists,'\* represented, without any authority, as two state addresses of the *two organized Bodies of London Ministers*, a procedure which made poor Baxter and the Presbyterians stand aghast, as likely to lead to a toleration of Socinians; and because, on occasion of Venner's plot, there were published 'A Remembrance and Declaration of the Congregational Churches and Public Preachers of their judgment, living in and about the City of London;' and because 'Mr. Nye and *some others*' of the Independents were encouraged to go to the king;† as Baxter says‡, or 'some of the non-conformists' *waiting privately* on the king, as Calamy declares,§ an event, in contradiction both to Baxter and Calamy, here magnified into a grand public procession, 'the Body of Congregational Ministers went to Court with an address,' though Nye certainly failed in his attempt to procure an address; and because a part of the London Baptists presented to James II. an address as a worthy companion to that of Vincent and of Lobb already noticed—because of all these reasons, taken together with the facts alleged respecting the Presbyterians, the conclusion is thus logically deduced: 'It appears, from *the most satisfactory historical evidence* that, during the reign of Charles II. and James II, the London Ministers of the Presbyterian, Congregational, and Baptist Denominations constituted three distinct, organized communities, recognized by the public authorities of the state, and enjoying and exercising severally the privilege of presenting petitions and addresses in the royal presence.' The logic we leave with our readers; of the logicians we venture to inquire, whether it would not be more satisfactory to produce from the addresses which have been preserved, any one professing to have come from the Presbyterian Ministers of London? We fear that the sound of those words has never yet reached the ear of royalty.

In the reign of William III. the Presbyterian and Congregational ministers were associated on all public occasions; the Baptists by themselves presented their addresses to the throne. From the accession of Queen Anne the ministers of the Three Denominations have uniformly acted in concert. There can be on

\* Oldmixon, vol. i. p. 483. See also Baxter and Calamy.

† Life, part ii. p. 430.

‡ Calamy's Baxter, p. 305.



these points no controversy. A difference, however, of some importance occurs, respecting the manner or character in which the several parties acted. On the one side it seems to be implied that the ministers of the several denominations held occasional or frequent meetings, *pro re nata*, without being regularly constituted into distinct organized Bodies. On the other, that they already had formed themselves into distinct, definite, and permanent communities. We think the former the correct assumption, though the latter is indispensable in sustaining the case of the Presbyterians.

In the address, presented on the arrival of the Prince of Orange, occur these expressions: 'That they should all most willingly have chosen that for the season of paying this duty to his Highness, when the Lord Bishop and the clergy of London attended his Highness for the same purpose, which some of them did, and which his Lordship was pleased condescendingly to make mention of to his Highness, had their notice of that intended application been so early as to make their more general attendance possible to them at that time;—that, therefore, though they did now appear in a distinct company, they did not on a distinct account, but on that only which was common to them and to all Protestants.'

Some of the Dissenting ministers waited on the Prince, together with the bishop and clergy of London, a few days before, and were noticed by the bishop as a part of the Body for whom he presented the Address. They could have attended on such an occasion in no corporate capacity, but simply as individuals permitted to present an Address. Yet, when the Dissenting ministers attended in a Body, they expressly declare that, had there been a more general attendance on the previous occasion, they would not then have appeared as a distinct company. This is clearly not the language of an organized Body, in the exercise of a privilege which belonged to them in that character. Dissenting ministers, in various parties as well as unitedly, have been permitted personally to address their Sovereign.

In the pamphlet under review, some notice is taken of the Union of the Presbyterian and Congregational ministers, partially commenced, as we have seen, after the declaration of Indulgence by Charles II., but finally consolidated in the year 1691. The ministers who were parties to this Union, amounting to about eighty, certainly constituted themselves into an organized Body, of which 'the Heads of Agreement assented to by the United Ministers, in and about London, formerly called 'Presbyterian and Congregational,' formed the basis. Still this was a Union of individuals, and not of previously constituted Bodies, and to that extent resembled the subsequent Union of the Three Denominations. That the Congregationalists did not act

in any corporate capacity, is evident from the fact that some of their number never belonged to the Union.\* The Congregationalists, who had united, withdrew gradually, and not in a Body; and though most of them were accustomed to meet at Pinner's Hall on the same day and hour as the United Brethren associated at Dr. Annesley's Meeting-house; yet a few never joined their seceding brethren.† We ask, therefore, where at this time was the organized Congregational Body? Was it with the United Ministers? Some acknowledged Congregationalists never joined them. Was it with the separatists in Pinner's Hall? Some never associated with them. We have before us a pamphlet printed in 1699, professing to be a 'Declaration of the 'Congregational Ministers in and about London;' but we have also the answer to this pamphlet, which denies that it was issued by the Congregational ministers. In the rejoinder, instead of appealing to the Resolutions or Minutes of any Body of Congregationalists, the authors of the pamphlet say that, 'excepting 'two or three ministers, to whom we thought not fit to communicate the said declaration, all the pastors of Congregational 'churches in and about this city, did consider and approve it.' It is evident they referred to individuals and not to a corporate Body.

The compilers of 'the case' say, 'Each Body remained distinct, observing its own rules, admitting its own members, regulating its own internal affairs, and retaining its discriminating 'name.' This, as we believe, is pure invention, unauthorized fiction. We know nothing about Bodies, but the ministers who united under 'the Heads of Agreement,' avowedly and expressly abandoned the Sectarian terms, Presbyterian and Congregational; though it is true, that on the dissolution of the Union they reverted to their ancient designations. As no authority is adduced for their assertions, we can only say, that had we the honour of a personal acquaintance with the compilers, we would most earnestly entreat them, with the promise that no use shall be made of the information in this controversy, to give us some account of the rules and mode of admitting members in this Congregational Body. To prevent mistake, we add, that we know that many Congregational ministers were accustomed to meet in Pinner's Hall, some at the Amsterdam Coffee House, and several in other Friendly Associations; but we ask for a Body to which, in 1691, all the Congregationalists belonged. The meeting

---

\* Answer to Mr. Humphrey's Letter, and Answer to Report of United Committee, in Dr. Williams's Works, Vol. IV., *passim*.

† Dr. Williams says, Answer to Report, Vol. IV., p. 334, 'All the Congregational brethren, except the Reverend and upright Mr. Barker, and a very few more, joined at a separate party from us.'

at Pinner's Hall commenced with three or four high Calvinists, and afterwards was gradually enlarged by seceders from the United brethren. This assembly, therefore, cannot be adduced as the ancient Congregational Board, existing and publicly recognized at the Restoration. We have a right to demand either the evidence of some other and older Association of Congregationalists, or the retraction of whole pages of unauthorized assertion.

The Baptist members of London, on two occasions, were, in the reign of William, permitted to address their Sovereign, as is expressed in the titles of both their Addresses, 'in behalf of themselves and their several congregations.'\* These words are unfairly suppressed in the pamphlet under review, and the mutilated title given is, 'The humble address of the 'Ministers of the Baptist Denomination in and about the City 'of London.'

From the accession of Queen Anne the members of the Three Denominations have always united on public and political occasions, and have intrusted the management of their interests to a Committee, chosen in definite proportions by the several parties who have acted in Union. The ministers, however, did not then constitute themselves into a permanent Body, but merely assembled for specific purposes in their common character of Dissenters. To have been a minister of some one of the several denominations seems to have been all that was necessary to give a right to attend and vote at their meetings. We admit that the Presbyterians, from the dissolution of the Society of the United Ministers, formed an Association among themselves, and were sometimes called the United Presbyterian Ministers; but we are prepared to show that ministers were admitted on public occasions as Presbyterians who were not members of the Association. This Association grew out of a separation *on the ground of doctrinal distinctions* from the Congregationalists, and was formed in avowed opposition to the notions of Dr. Crisp; but the compilers of 'the case' tell us, page 32, that their Body was 'formed upon 'the principle of avoiding all doctrinal distinctions, and virtually 'dissolved as soon as such distinctions were permitted to be 'made.' We wish they had told us when it was so formed. Besides, the United Presbyterian Ministers were not associated with a reference to political occasions, but for 'their meetings 'on their private church affairs'—the 'placing ministers in the 'country in proper and vacant places'—the securing and educating young men for their ministry—and, in connexion with some

---

\* Crosby, Vol. IV., pp. 278, 357.



of the laity, the distribution of the Presbyterian fund, and generally promoting the Presbyterian interest.\*

As the meetings at Salters' Hall were held but a few years before the permanent Union of the Three Denominations, they furnish the best illustrations of the state of the Dissenting Body immediately previous to that event. We learn, from the 'Authentic Account,' page 18, that 'the names of all present were set down, and then called over one by one, each denomination being to approve or disapprove of such as were reported to belong to them, and exceptions were allowed to be made against any whose presence with us might be objected to.' Reflections were made upon the vote of some of the majority, although their right had been acknowledged at two previous meetings.† And further, the local limitations of the Body was undetermined, and discussed in several of the pamphlets published on the occasion—some confining the indefinite expression, 'in and about London,' to the bills of mortality, and others asking if it extended as far as Chelmsford or Maidstone. It is thus evident that within eight years of the formation of the General Union, the Dissenting ministers did not form a permanent and accurately defined Body, although often constituted into a Body for specific purposes, according to the circumstances of the occasion. Judging from the persons who were present at the Salters' Hall Synod, considerable latitude was then given to the expression, 'the London Ministers.' We are not, however, very anxious to press this point, because the Presbyterians appear to be in a dilemma, and to us it is a matter of perfect indifference on which horn they choose to be mangled. Is the present Presbyterian Body, the identical Body of Presbyterians which formed with the Independents and Baptists of London the Salters' Hall Convention? If it be not the same, where was it in 1719? We read of but one Body of Presbyterians, and they were at Salters' Hall. If it be the self-same Body, it stands committed to a doctrinal test, for that Body in Salters' Hall, that is, the non-subscribing majority claiming the title of the Body, 'freely declared that we utterly disown the Arian doctrine, and sincerely believe the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity.' Either the present Presbyterian Body was not in existence in 1719, or, if it were, it adopted a doctrinal test. On either alternative, their 'case' is worthless.

We fear we have not only exhausted the patience of our read-

---

\* See, among the other pamphlets of the period, the Memoirs of Dr. Williams, addressed to Mr. Pierce, 1718.

† Defence of Reasons, &c., p. 33.

ers, but also taken a great deal of superfluous trouble in refuting 'the case' of the Presbyterians. It is vexatious to find, on glancing the eye a second time over their pamphlet, that it very quietly and comfortably refutes itself. The conclusion at which it arrives is thus expressed, p. 24: 'It has been shown, from the 'most decisive evidence, that the ministers of the several deno- 'minations, in and about the cities of London and Westminster, 'have, from the passing of the Act of Uniformity, and even from 'an earlier date, formed three distinct and organized associations 'or bodies, which, however changed as to their individual mem- 'bers, *have preserved their separate character and identity* down 'to the present time.' Yet we are told, p. 14, in reference to the dissolution of the 'United Brethren,' about 1697, that 'The Con- 'gregational Ministers either organized themselves into the social 'form under which they had been bound to one another before their 'union with the Presbyterians, or had embodied themselves *into a 'new association* of a similar kind;'—and that 'the Presbyterian 'Ministers, also, had either fallen back into their former state, or 'adopted a somewhat changed mode of social incorporation.' So that, although the Congregationalists formed a new association, and the Presbyterians changed their incorporation, yet they wonderfully contrived to preserve the identity of both bodies. The old Presbyterians would have been puzzled with the logic, as well as frightened with the theology, of their successors. Of their body it is predicated that, although it has changed its members, renewed its incorporation, altered its mode, we may add, lost its minutes, shifted its locality, altered its limits, revised its rules, abandoned its principles, forsaken its doctrines, abjured its spirit, changed its name, disowned its engagements, repudiated its object, and renounced its connexions; yet it is still the exact, selfsame, identical, *ipsissimum* body which cursed heretics in Zion College, took fright before Charles II. at the very possibility of a toleration of Socinians, joined the Independents in Stepney Meeting in a solemn recognition of three confessions of faith, two catechisms, and nine doctrinal 'Heads of Agreement,' proclaimed in Salters' Hall its belief in the doctrine of 'the Blessed Trinity;' and, moreover, strange as it may seem, has been 'formed upon the principle of avoiding all doctrinal distinctions, 'and virtually dissolved as soon as such distinctions were permitted 'to be made.' The Presbyterians best understand their own constitution, which to us seems a strange compound of contrarieties. Will they kindly explain how their body, to which doctrine is virtual death, having been thrice killed with the poison, at Zion College, at Stepney, and at Salters' Hall, still lives, though somewhat emaciated, in the Library of Red Cross Street? Or is it the ghost of murdered Presbyterianism which still haunts the property of Dr.

Williams, and seems to threaten a visit to the palace and throne of the British monarch?

Whether the Presbyterians will present themselves at court is not for us to determine. According to their own account the privilege, even if a precedent could be found in the archives of England, has become obsolete by the lapse of a hundred and fifty years. We are, however, heartily desirous that they should appear before 'the face of the world.' Let their body show itself in its proper dimensions. Let it proceed by itself, and attract the gaze of the public. There will then be exhibited before the Sovereign of this realm the few relics of a once numerous and influential party. Some six or seven pastors, and as many elderly gentlemen, assuming or retaining the title and attire of the clergy, will represent the body whose voice was once heard in the most secret and the most mighty councils of the land. The fragments of the Presbyterian interest, the ruins of the old conventicle, the rags of the Geneva cloak, furnish a fair specimen of the practical working of the Unitarian creed. The lesson is precious, and ought never to be forgotten. So far from desiring to prevent the Presbyterian Ministers of London from appearing before the throne, we would show them in parade as publicly and as often as we could; we would bring them out in annual procession on St. Bartholomew's Day, and give them the opportunity, refreshed with ancient recollections, and glorying in their present prosperity, to address their fellow-citizens in language becoming their condition. 'We are the men who once filled your streets with our doctrine, though now our disciples are scarcely to be found; who once instructed your listening fathers, though now we are denied a pedagogue's place on the lower form of your children; who, once the rulers of your municipality, and the masters of your crowd, vindicated your liberty, dethroned your monarch, frightened an usurper, overawed a parliament, restored a king, and emptied your churches when expelled from your pulpits. Mark our numbers and condition, and observe what great things Unitarianism has done for the old Presbyterian cause! say, whether our anticipations are over sanguine or fanatic, when we tell you that our creed is making wonderful progress, and likely soon to become the religion of the world.'



Art. II. *Memoirs of Simon Episcopius, Pupil of Arminius, and subsequently Doctor of Divinity, and Professor of Theology in the University of Leyden. To which is added, a Brief Account of the Synod of Dort.* By FREDERICK CALDER. 8vo. Simpkin and Marshall, London.

WE have, most assuredly, no partiality for ecclesiastical assemblies, however designated, when armed with power, either polemical or political: and we have this plain reason for our dislike—that we shrink from the sight of human passions and prejudices, intruding themselves, under the thread-worn cloak of zeal, into the sanctuary of God. We know of but one council, if council it must be called, concerning which there can be no question as to the purity of its motives or the correctness of its decision; and, waiving the matter of inspiration, it would not be difficult to prove that every such convention, since the Council of Jerusalem, including not only the infallible Council of Trent, but the no less unerring Synod of Dort, has done deep injury to the cause of Christian truth and charity. Yet is the history of such associations, whether ecumenical or provincial, of the highest interest and importance. They were at once the creatures and the controllers of their times; they expressed, but they modified the character of their age: they answered, to a certain extent, the purposes for which they were called together, but their very existence involved a dangerous concession either to political exigence, or to popular opinion, and the rulers who were able to resist or to evade, were wiser or luckier in their generation than those who yielded either to expediency or force.

The history of these assemblages includes a large portion of the history of Christendom. They serve, adopting a military phrase, as so many successive bases of operation, where the inquirer may halt, review his progress, and collect his resources for either making good his actual position, or facilitating his further advance. Each of them was a central point, towards which facts and motives had long been tending, and the very exercise of tracing out its secret and public history, includes the acquisition and collation of a great body of circumstantial evidence, bearing upon the great questions of doctrine or of discipline, which at that period agitated the Christian world. In this view, then, the economy of councils deserves the steady research of the ecclesiastical student, as a profitable task. If he should too often have to explore 'long passages that lead to nothing,' or to struggle through rugged and rather muddy paths, he will, on the other hand, find himself contemplating human character in some of its most impressive exhibitions, both of greatness and infirmity: he may see error long ascendant, opinion long perverted, the prevalence of evil apparently secured; but he will also discern truth gradually winning its way; oppression, amid its victories, rudely

shaken from time to time by the stern grasp of some master-mind, outstriding the slow movements of his age; and he will rise from his investigation with a better knowledge of the heart and the history of man, and with a clearer view of the dispensations by which God is preparing a people for himself, and triumph for his people.

Ecclesiastical history has rarely been written in a right spirit; and of a truth it requires, in whoever may assume the task, a combination of qualities very rarely uniting in the same individual. Piety, knowledge, mental power, may have been happily blended in some who have addressed themselves to the work, but there is a more excellent gift even than these, and we fear that there is still to seek the man who shall combine with these high and indispensable faculties, the still higher historical quality of an impartial mind, firm in its own convictions, but clear in discernment, and uniting skill to detect its own prejudices with strength to control their workings.

There are two names, among those who have obtained popularity in this department of historical inquiry, which may be cited in illustration of these suggestions. No man, we are sure, ever wrote with purer intentions than those which actuated Milner in his meritorious labours on Church History; yet, whatever value may in some respects attach to his work, there can be no question but that it is, on the whole, a failure. Yet was Joseph Milner a pious and strong-minded man; and his tract in answer to Gibbon, indicates considerable familiarity with ecclesiastical antiquity. Where then are we to look for the causes which prevented him from obtaining a more decided success in a series of labours, for which he should seem to have been competently qualified by knowledge, ability, and sincerity of purpose? Without adverting to certain countervailing deficiencies which tended to impair the effect of his better qualities, we should say that some of the most important sections of his book exhibit most injuriously the operation of strong prejudice, not merely in favour of established hierarchies, but against every thing that might tend to interfere with their power and permanency. Unless we greatly deceive ourselves, this fatal taint affects, in an especially disadvantageous manner, his representation of the life and labours of Wickliffe; and it is not too much to affirm, of failure here, that it must invalidate the entire exhibition of the progress of that Reformation with which his mission had so inseparable a connexion. The second name, to which we had reference at the commencement of this paragraph, is that of Jortin, a writer whose qualities, whether good or bad, were as much at opposition with those of Milner as can well be imagined. In some respects, Jortin was admirably fitted for the task that he undertook; his quick and keen perception of error and incongruity, qualified him excellently for the

detection of abuses, while his sarcastic temper and epigrammatic style enabled him to expose them with overwhelming effect. But these qualities were unchastised by a serious and anxious spirit; a relaxed theology betrays itself too decidedly, not to shake our confidence in his representations and inferences. Neither does he seem to have made a distinct study of the original sources, or to have compared conflicting authorities, with fair and equitable purpose. If it had been possible for these two divines to have worked in partnership, to have so far combined their views and feelings as to melt down their prejudices and perversities, and to give the world a *conspectus* of ecclesiastical history, distinguished by the shrewdness of Jortin, and the honesty of Milner, the result would have been a work which might have supplied a deficiency that is still deeply felt.

But the volume in hand reminds us that our present business is not with the general history of the church, but with one of those important sections concerning which it is especially desirable to obtain accurate and ample information. The 'Synod of Dort' stands as the heading of a chapter, instructive in no small degree, but demanding in its management, a skill and intelligence very rarely to be found among ecclesiastical writers, and not these only, but that still rarer impartiality which, at all times desirable, is then most indispensably requisite, when the truth is to be elicited from the fierce contradictions of theological strife. In all such cases, the testimony of actors and bystanders is of the highest value, especially when it involves circumstances which may be taken as guarantees for the good faith of the witness. We shall presently show that there is valuable evidence of this kind to illustrate the theological character of the Synod of Dort; but as we have hitherto indulged in a somewhat excursive train of comment, we shall venture to continue it in a passing reference to another ecclesiastical convention, between which and the Dutch Assembly there might be traced more than one point of resemblance. The Dort Synod and the Council of Trent, however they might differ in other respects, agreed in these—in both, while religious matters were the ostensible, and with some the real, objects, political interests supplied the motives which urged on the more powerful promoters of the great tragi-comedy—both, too, were the last experiments of the kind that have been made on so large a scale, and so public a theatre. To the Tridentine convocation went legates, nuncios, prelates, doctors, ambassadors, and chargé d'affaires, of all sorts, characters, and capacities; and their public acts are on record to tell too plainly that their errand was to serve, not the cause of God, but the wretched rapacities of men. Among these ill-assorted groupings of divines and diplomatists, there was one individual presenting himself in an humble official character, but maintaining an unsleeping watchfulness over



every movement, public or private, of the different parties, and of the more influential personages. The great interests at stake were those of the pope and the emperor; and though the true policy of both was the same, the perverted views of Rome made that an issue which should have been a point of close and cordial agreement. It was the interest of Charles V. to obtain such concessions, and to effect such ecclesiastical reforms, as should tend either to conciliate the German Protestants, or to diminish the number of those who, though not altogether symbolizing with their creed, wished well to their cause from its obvious justice. On the other hand, the Vaticanists clung shamelessly to power and pelf in the shape of the most enormous abuses. The emperor's affairs at the council were committed ostensibly to the management of Don Francisco de Toledo, but among the canonists and civilians who attended him officially, there was one charged with a confidential mission by the famous Perrenot, then bishop of Arras, but better known historically as Cardinal Granvelle, and Chancellor of the Imperial Court. The fiscal Vargas was attached to the embassy for the purpose of keeping up a close correspondence with that eminent minister, and by a singular, though not clearly explained chance, a considerable collection of letters connected with this transaction, came into the hands of the Trumbull family. These papers, with others throwing farther light on the intrigues of that busy time, have never been published in the original, but two distinct translations have appeared, one into English, by Dr. Michael Geddes, at the suggestion of the Bishop of Worcester, Stillingfleet; the other, in French, by Le Vassor, under the patronage of Sir William Trumbull, Secretary of State in the reign of William III. Better authorization cannot be desired; and the various illustrations given by the translators, especially by the foreigner, who frequently introduces citations from the Spanish, clear the matter from the slightest vestige of a doubt. In these letters will be found fearful expositions of the craft and knavery of papal policy; the diplomatic folk seem to have monopolized all honesty and good intention, while the gentry of the shaven crown ran a fair race with each other in faithlessness and rapacity. There was strange scrambling among the Spanish prelates for the good things in the gift of the crown, and it is amusing to see the smiling courtesy with which Granvelle *bows out* the various applicants. Vargas shows up the legate; Cardinal Crescentio, with an unsparing exposure, and altogether, though the observer may not always be able to check a lighter feeling, at the sight of so much grasping and so much grovelling, he will oftener yield to indignant emotion in the view of shameless rejection of lofty principle, treacherous compromise between interest and plain duty, base trafficking for the favour of the great, and utter disregard of the professed object for which the entire machinery was

set in motion, the advancement of religion. The letters of Vargas, Malvenda, and the Spanish prelates, might be advantageously attached as an appendix, to the immortal work of Father Paul.

Something of the same kind are the letters of John Hales, the 'ever memorable,' addressed to Sir Dudley Carleton, English Ambassador to the Stadtholder and States of Holland, in the reign of James I. Hales was chaplain to the embassy, and in that capacity only, without official character, was present at the public sittings of the Synod of Dort; apparently, by the wish of Sir Dudley, to whom he rendered a regular account of the proceedings. John Hales was a very different man from Francisco Vargas; inferior, if it be inferiority, in the subtleties of diplomacy; he stood on an unspeakably loftier elevation with regard to all that is powerful and original in mind. The letters in question are admirable illustrations of his clear and capacious intellect: shrewd and somewhat sarcastic, his pithy comments on the bitter wranglings of the different parties, show plainly enough how little the glory of God was consulted, and how much the bad passions and self-will of men. He avoids all political allusion, either from considerations of prudence, or because such 'high matter' came not within his commission; but his tact in theological matters, and his discernment in estimating character, are most admirable. Neither the Synodists nor the Remonstrants escape his shrewd detection; it was in truth a strange business altogether, and if any one wish to know how little good is likely to be effected by such assemblies, he cannot do better than read these piquant and instructive compositions. The representations of John Hales are confirmed by the statements of Walter Balcanqual, deputy from the Scotch kirk. He seems to have been an able and right-minded man, and his letters, read in sequence with those of Hales, will be found to throw light upon the transactions of the synod.

In truth, the Synod of Dort seems to have been, from the first, in what it is just now the fashion to call a false position. Tainted, at the very outset, by the strong suspicion of political rather than religious motives in the ambitious statesman who prompted, while they affected only to concede, its convocation: assembling in opposition to the wish of three, at least, of the most influential among the provinces: assuming the prerogatives of a judicature without appeal, and arraigning, in that character, the Remonstrants as a body of men under a criminal charge; in these and other respects, they exposed themselves to severe animadversion, and to direct challenge as a pre-occupied and unfairly constituted tribunal. Nor did they redeem these primary errors by skill and discretion in their interior management, or in the conduct of their proceedings. In that most important measure, the choice of a president, who was to be the director of their de-

liberations, and their orator on all public occasions, they appear to have made a mischievous blunder. Bogerman was, we take it for granted, a person of ability and learning, but he failed in what was on such an occasion even more important,—command of temper and courtesy of demeanor. He suffered himself repeatedly to be betrayed into a petulance, which contrasted awkwardly with the gentlemanly bearing and self-possession of Episcopus. His abrupt and vituperative dismissal of the Remonstrants, at the last, was strangely ill-judged; and when charged, in a private session, with having been *paulo commotior*, and with using *verba quædam acerba*, he seems to have made but a lame defence. There was indeed, but too much foundation for the charge, since he had gone so far as to taunt his opponents with *fraudes, artes, et mendacia*, and to threaten them with the *arma spiritualia* of the Batavian churches. To all this intemperate language, Episcopus replied by a calm though stern appeal to the righteous judgment of God; but Sapma was less guarded. *Ereo*, exclaimed he, as he quitted the assembly, *ex ecclesia malignantium*. On the other hand, it should never be forgotten that there were present in the Synod of Dort, aiding in its general proceedings and approving its doctrinal decisions, theologians eminent for wisdom, knowledge, and godliness, the lights of the Christian world: men who abhorred persecution in every shape, and taking no share in the subsequent crusade against the Arminians. That warfare was political not religious; it was directed against the Remonstrants not as a sect, but as a party; and they fell victims to the ambition of Maurice, not to the intolerance of the dominant sect. Without retracting or relaxing our protest against all such pio-political convocations, we shall not hesitate to express our conviction that the Synod of Dort, so far as the interests of religion were involved, was an instrument of much good: at a season of some hazard to the purity of evangelical doctrine, it made a vigorous stand in its defence; and, without pledging ourselves to the reception of all its theological definitions, we feel satisfied with its ultimate decisions, as giving, on the whole, a clear view of evangelical truth, and as establishing an effectual barrier against the advocates of a relaxed discipline, and a low standard of religious belief.

We come at length to Mr. Calder, and the proof that we do not mean to spend much time in the analysis of his book, may be inferred from the length and desultoriness of our preface. In truth, we must decline altogether any thing like a regular conference with a gentleman who, setting out with high professions of impartiality, fulfils his pledge by making his work a *ramassis* of queer and gossiping statements and annotations, all tending to prove that the author is a thorough-going Arminian, and that he cherishes a very satisfactory antipathy to Calvinism 'in all its branches.' We regret this exceedingly, because there has thus



been thrown away a fair opportunity of exhibiting and elucidating a part of ecclesiastical history which has not yet been presented in a compact and convenient form. We no more wish an Arminian to write in the language of a Calvinist, than we should like to see the process reversed: let an author, by all means, avow and support his opinions, calmly and courteously: but there is a wide difference between this reasonable maintenance of deliberate views, and the partizan spirit which incapacitates for the contemplation of a question, excepting under one particular aspect; which mingles gross personalities with doctrinal discussion, and writes history in the temper of a party pamphlet. That we do not go too far in applying these characteristics to the very zealous and self-complacent dogmatist, whose volume lies before us, will be manifest to any one who may take the trouble of going through a single chapter of its contents.

The life of Episcopus is not only an interesting but a weighty subject, and it might have been put to effective use by a competent and Catholic-minded writer. In its date it touches on events of the greatest importance in the political history of modern Europe, and inseparably connected with the progress of civil society. It demands for its adequate treatment the vigorous discussion of questions most momentous, and of principles which lie at the foundation of civil and religious government. The facts of the biography itself are both directly and collaterally interesting, and there are to be drawn from them inferences fraught with impressive admonition. Yet we cannot go into this attractive subject, since Mr. Calder does not supply us with sufficient materials; and we shrink from the herculean labour of reviving and sustaining, by extensive reference, recollections somewhat dimmed by lapse of years. There is one point, especially, which we regret our present inability to examine with the requisite precision; we could have wished for means and opportunity to trace out the history of that declension in sound doctrine which seems to have found its way into the Remonstrant churches, soon after at least, if not during, the time of Episcopus. This is a matter of deep import, and we should be gratified by seeing it adequately explained.

The personal character of Episcopus cannot, we believe, be questioned in any particular. He appears to have been courteous in demeanour, and of unblemished conduct, both in civic and domestic life. His natural abilities were great, and he had sharpened and strengthened them by constant exercise. As an elegant scholar he attracted the admiration of his contemporaries, and as a ready debater of all theological questions, he was put forward as their spokesman by the Remonstrants when cited before the Synod. On that memorable occasion, he proved himself *par negotio*, though he does not seem to have felt much scruple

in using an occasional stratagem in his dealings with an enemy. 'Episcopus,' says John Hales, 'is reported to have put a trick 'upon the seculars;' and in either instance he appears to have resorted with effect to the 'diamond-cut-diamond' system, in his dealings with those whom he doubtless considered as unprincipled adversaries. It was a manœuvre of this sort to put forward the decree of reprobation as the leading point of discussion, instead of taking the controversy on a large and liberal scale: the Arminians knew their popular ground, and the Gomarists knew it too, for they evaded the challenge. It is the high praise of Episcopus that he was not only admired but beloved; his enemies allowed his intellectual eminence, and for the most part, exhibited less personal acrimony in his particular instance, than might have been expected from the conspicuous share which he took in the struggle between two parties, whose warfare was marked by so much bitterness. It is gratifying to know, that after the agitations of the earlier period of his life, this distinguished man was permitted to return from an exile, disgraceful only to his persecutors, though painful to himself, and to spend his later years in peace and honour among his countrymen and friends: he died in April, 1643.

Were we disposed to exercise severity towards Mr. Calder, we might find ample materials in the strange *pot-pourri* which he has concocted in the shape of notes. There is, indeed, one passage of this kind from which we find it difficult to withhold the measure of severity which it deserves; we shall, however, content ourselves with leaving it to Mr. Calder's better consideration, whether the paltry circumstances, true or false, detailed at page 534, deserved insertion in the life of Episcopus, or in any other record whatsoever; and whether the language in which they are expressed, becomes the character of a gentleman or a Christian? Another of these singular annotations we shall insert:—

'We shall never forget the case of a lady, the mother—and naturally a tender, affectionate mother—of a fine family, to whom it was intimated, when advocating the doctrine of absolute election and reprobation, that, if the opinion she entertained was true, it might bear with an awful aspect on her own children. Winding herself up to meet the statement, she answered, with a calm front, a glassy eye, an unblanched cheek, and an air of assumed indifference, 'I can't help that; neither indeed have I any right to allow my feelings as a mother to be excited in opposition to the divine purposes.'—Note, p. 206.

Mr. Calder seems quite unaware of the utter worthlessness of this appeal, taken as argument; and of the strange ignorance of the courtesy due to sex and circumstance, that could allow him to use such language to a female and a mother. He appears incapable of understanding the dignified rebuke conveyed in what

he is pleased to represent as a demeanour of 'assumed indifference,' and 'feigned sternness.' It has happened to ourselves to be assailed by this cogent sort of reasoning, and we most certainly did not imitate the forbearance of this lady; we contrived to let our opponent understand, in brief and 'stern' phrase, that, by an *ad hominem*, so unfeeling and so imbecile, he perilled his own reputation both as a man and a reasoner, without in any degree endangering our position. One more specimen and we have done with Mr. Calder.

'The assumption of a more perfect knowledge of *the Gospel*, as identified with an adoption of the opinions of Calvin and Beza, will not of course be given up without some lingering feelings of attachment to such an assumed eminence of attainment, by those who have been accustomed to advance it; and hence the editors of *The Eclectic Review*, in their number for February, 1835, when commenting on the works of the late Alexander Knox, Esq., who seemed to have had very strong Arminian propensities, and put forth Arminian statements, say of him, 'His intellectual range was lofty rather than comprehensive, the current of his thoughts ran more deep than clear; he is any thing but superficial, yet there are shallows every now and then in his reasoning.' We suppose, if the paradox may be allowed, that these *shallows* appear when he gets into the *deeps* of Calvinism. Still, however, there are great concessions to Arminianism in the above statement. Formerly it would have run thus. His intellectual range was *limited* rather than comprehensive; the current of his thoughts ran more *muddy* than clear; he is very superficial, and shallows *constantly* appear in his reasoning.'—Note, p. 439.

What can possibly be said in reply to such whimsical imputations as this? We have no recollection of the passage, and it is not worth while to go in search of it; but, as it stands, can any thing be more innocent of all reference to religious doctrine of any kind? It is simply an attempt, in terms highly laudatory, to give a discriminating character of a writer's peculiar cast of mind; yet, Mr. Calder's penetration has enabled him to detect in it, a 'lingering attachment' to 'an assumed eminence of attainment,' and 'great concessions to Arminianism'!

It has always appeared to us something worse than absurdity, that there should be any other than the most friendly difference between truly Christian men, whether they adopt the views of Calvin or Arminius. They unite in all the great lines of evangelical truth; they serve a common Master in the same spirit, and on the same grounds of faith; they harmonize in essentials, and, for the most part, agree in 'things indifferent;' why, then, should they not, when they both reach in the same cause, a difficulty common to truth—the great problem of God's supremacy, and man's accountability—make it the subject of friendly con-



ference (*amica collatio*), rather than of harsh controversy. Has either party solved the mystery, or is it still among the deep things of God? However this may be, it certainly appears to us that the Arminian cuts the knot, while the Calvinist endeavours, at least, to untie it. The Arminian escapes the pressure for the present, only, to meet it farther on; he removes the *nodus* from the counsels of God, to connect it with the Divine prescience and the final judgment.

Before we close, we are anxious to assist Mr. Calder in a little matter about which he puzzles himself without any apparent necessity. Having described the spirited conduct of a burgomaster of Leyden, he informs us that 'there is a confusion among his-torians as to the name of this magistrate, some calling him 'Adrian, others Vanderwerf. We think it was the latter.' Why not both? If we recollect rightly, his name was Adrian Vanderwerf. There was a celebrated painter of the same name and surname.

---

Art. III. *The Great Metropolis.* By the Author of 'Random Recollections of the Lords and Commons.' Second Series. 2 vols. 12mo. London: Saunders and Otley. 1837.

WE are glad to meet the author of the *Great Metropolis* again. The varied contents, and interesting character of his former publications, render him a most acceptable companion to the majority of readers. His *Random Recollections*, in which he first sought the favour of the public, was one of the happiest efforts of an inventive and fertile mind. Every unprejudiced reader was pleased with it, and all were surprised that something of the kind had not been previously attempted. Ill-natured critics exulted in the detection of minor inaccuracies; and disappointed senators, who had looked in vain for the measure of praise which their vanity craved, vented their spleen against the author and his book; but the country at large applauded his performance, and hoped he would prosecute his labours. This he did with the most praiseworthy diligence, and the *Great Metropolis* was the result. Every one was surprised at the amount of information which this work contained, and endless inquiries were made respecting the mode in which it had been gathered. Our author would seem to have been present every where. There was no niche or corner, no class or occupation within the precincts of the great city with which he did not show himself familiar. He seemed to have penetrated into the most exclusive circles of the aristocracy, and to have witnessed the unbridled exhibition of brute passions amongst the lower orders. The

Clubs, the Theatres, and the Gaming-houses, the Periodical literature, and the daily press, all passed under his review—and each became more familiar to the public, than it had previously been. We are glad to find that his labours were not unappreciated. The diligence displayed in collecting materials, and the skill with which they were combined, entitled him to the patronage of the public, and it is satisfactory to learn that that patronage has not been withheld. Of this we are informed in the brief preface to the volumes before us. ‘The very great success,’ it is remarked, ‘of the first two volumes, coupled with the circumstance of their being necessarily incomplete of themselves, has induced the author to lose no longer time in the preparation of the present, than was rendered unavoidable from the nature of the undertaking.’ This is as it should be, and we hope our author will continue thus to earn and to repay the favour of his countrymen.

The contents of the present series are as varied as those of the former. It is divided into ten chapters, the titles of which we subjoin, as an indication of what the reader may expect. Almack’s, Political Opinions, Literature, Authors and Publishers, Bank of England, Stock Exchange, Royal Exchange, Old Bailey, Newgate, and Penny-a-liners. We are somewhat at a loss what passages to quote, having marked so many as to make selection difficult. We shall, however, follow the bent of our own minds, and having been most interested in those chapters which relate to literature and authors, we shall presume on our readers’ taste being equally correct as our own, and make our extracts principally from them. The following passage will probably surprise many who are in the habit of reading the advertisements of some of our London publishers. We rejoice in the conviction of its truth, and shall be glad to find the statement corroborated by additional facts.

‘About twenty years ago, the literary tide set in in favour of fiction. The extraordinary success of the Waverly Novels stimulated a host of writers to apply themselves to works of a similar class. If those who, after Sir Walter Scott, were the earliest in this literary field, did not acquire the same fame, or derive the same pecuniary advantage as the Magician of the North, they were sufficiently successful to encourage them to make new efforts, and to induce others to follow their example. Hence, about ten or twelve years since, when the mania for works of fiction was at its height, it was calculated that from two to three hundred appeared in the course of the year. All of them of any note could boast a sale of from 750 to 1,000: decidedly good ones often reached a sale of from 1,500 to 2,000 copies. A striking change has since come over the spirit of this class of literature. The authors, whose works of fiction a dozen years since commanded a sale of from 1,500 to 2,000 copies, cannot now command a sale of 500. I could mention many instances in confirmation of this, but it would be equally

invidious to authors and publishers. I may state in general terms, that on one day, about six months ago, four novels, two of them by authors of great celebrity in the high and palmy days of works of fiction, were published by different houses, and that the sale of neither of the works exceeded 350 copies; that of three out of the four was under that number. Publishers have now come to the conclusion—a conclusion forced on them by painful experience—that the days of this class of works are past for ever. Authors may continue to write, but publishers will not publish, except in comparatively few cases, even though the copyright were offered them for nothing. If authors *will* write novels, they must publish them at their own risk. This, indeed, has been the case, though the public are not aware of the fact, in many instances of late years, as I shall have occasion afterwards to show at some length. The truth is, that, with the exception of the works of fifteen or twenty authors, no individual ever now dreams of purchasing a novel for his own reading. The only copies bought are for the circulating libraries.'—Vol. I., pp. 122—124.

Very few readers are aware of the pecuniary risk which is incurred in the supply of their intellectual wants. It is frequently supposed by the uninitiated that the publishing business is a mine of wealth, and that a successful author, in any department, must be a rich man. Facts, however, are stubborn things, and what will our readers say to the following:—

'The number of books published last year in London, in the various departments of science and literature, were, as nearly as can be ascertained, 1500.

'It is calculated that out of every fifteen books published, taking them on the average, not more than one pays its own expenses. 'The Edinburgh Review' proved to demonstration, some years ago, that only one out of every fifty pamphlets which make their appearance, pay the expenses of paper, print, stitching, and advertising. On this subject I shall have something more to say, when I come to the chapter on 'Authors and Publishers.'

'Only one book, on an average, out of about 200, reaches a second edition. Out of 500 books, not more than one gets to a third edition; and out of 1,000 only one has the good fortune to reach a fourth edition.'—pp. 133, 134.

Some speculations must of course be successful, or woe would betide the hapless proprietor of many works, on which large sums have been expended, but for which the public are so unwise and ungrateful as to make no demand. The re-publications recently issued, have, in several cases, enabled the fortunate bibliopole to meet the deficiency of other accounts.

'The late republications, in a cheap and elegant form, of the works of popular authors, have very materially contributed to diminish the demand for new productions, published at the usual price. Nearly



40,000 copies of the re-publication of the works of Sir Walter Scott have been sold. Mr. Murray, it is understood, has disposed of 30,000 copies of Moore's 'Life and Works of Byron.' The same enterprising publisher has got rid of nearly 8,000 of his edition of the 'Works of Crabbe;' and I believe the sale of his Boswell's 'Life of Johnson,' and his 'Johnsoniana,' in ten volumes, has exceeded 5,000. That number of Allan Cunningham's 'Life and Works of Burns,' was sold by the publishers within twelve months of the completion of the edition. Mr. Valpy's edition of 'Shakspeare,' commanded a sale of 4,000; and his edition of 'Hume and Smollett's England,' was not much less successful. Messrs. Saunders and Otley's 'Life and Works of Cowper' has had a sale of some thousands. Messrs. Baldwin and Cradock's edition of the works of the same poet, has also had a tolerable sale, though I have not heard any statement of the extent. Of Mr. Macrone's edition of the 'Life and Works of Milton,' the sale has been between 1,500 and 2,000. All of these works have been sold at five shillings per volume; and in addition to the cheapness of the price, there have been, in every case, the further attractions of the best quality of paper, the most tasteful and accurate typography, beautifully executed engravings, and elegant binding. The circulation of so many volumes throughout the country within the last ten years, must of necessity have lessened, to a very great extent, the sale of those more expensive works which have been published during that period. The public taste, however, is beginning to be diverted from this class of publications, and is likely soon to be turned again into its former channel. Within the last two or three years the demand for such works has so much declined, that no publisher is likely, for some time to come, to engage with any re-publication of the same kind. The expense of getting them up is so great, and the price of each volume is so cheap, that a sale of less than 3,500 copies will not render the speculation a safe one for the publisher.'—pp. 137—139.

Are any of our readers aspiring after a literary life? If so, let us give them a word of caution. It is no uncommon thing to meet with ingenious and talented youths who regard the occupation of a literary man as an Arcadian state, securing both dignity and comfort. Deluded by a few extraordinary instances of success, they relinquish professions in which an honourable competency might be gained, and commit themselves to a current the direction and fluctuations of which are proverbially fickle. Literary occupation is a pleasing, and may be a remunerative engagement for a leisure hour. It may do well for an amusement, but in the great majority of cases it is a starving business. Many a noble spirit has been broken, and life has often been prematurely closed by the privations and bitter disappointments to which its followers have been subjected. Our author gives a sufficiently dark coloring to his picture, and has not, we suspect, insisted as he might have done, on the moral causes which co-operate in the production of the misery he depicts. If we are not greatly mis-

taken, much of the poverty and wretchedness which characterize the sons of genius, are attributable to their own improvidence or vice. But there is no questioning the general accuracy of his remarks.

‘The number of individuals,’ he says, ‘who live in London entirely by their literary labour, has been variously estimated. It is impossible to say with confidence what the exact number is. Among the various conjectures which have been made on the subject, that which computes the number to be about 4,000 appears to me to be the nearest approximation to the truth. Of this number, perhaps about 700 are, in one way or other, connected with periodicals. Many of them, I need hardly say, have no better than chameleon’s fare three days out of the seven. The joke of being poor was formerly used only in reference to poets; they have always been so remarkable for their poverty that the words poet and poverty have almost become synonymous. Now the evil of poverty is unhappily felt by the writers of prose as well as poetry, to an extent unparalleled in by-gone times. Grub-street was formerly supposed, by a sort of poetical fiction, to be the only locality of poor authors: now a dozen Grub-streets would not contain the number, even supposing they were to adopt the principle so strictly acted on among the Irish inhabitants of St. Giles’s, namely, of a dozen of them vegetating in the same apartment. Now-a-days there is hardly an attic in the humbler localities of the metropolis, but at present has, or has lately had, its poor author as an inmate. I have spoken of 4,000 as being the supposed number of persons who live by their literary labour: were I to include those who have *tried* to live by their literary exertions, but have been obliged to abandon ‘the profession,’ because they found they could not earn by it what was sufficient to keep soul and body together, I should have to double the number. There are scenes of destitution and misery ever and anon exhibited among literary men—aye, and literary women too,—which would make the heart sick. And it ought not to be forgotten that want comes armed to them with aggravated horrors. They are of necessity persons of more sensitive minds than the majority of other sufferers from the ills of poverty; and what adds to the pungency of their distress is the circumstance of their slighted intellectual efforts being almost invariably mixed up with their physical destitution. I myself could detail cases of wretchedness among literary men which have come under my own observation, at the bare mention of which every rightly constituted mind would stand appalled.’ . . . . .

‘The literary profession is, of all others, the most precarious. To-day you may be tolerably successful and in passably easy circumstances. To-morrow, you may be most unfortunate and have to encounter all the horrors of want. This year you may make a hit: you may write a work which will sell: next year, your effort is a decided failure: the day your work is born, is the day of its death.

‘It is all very well for young men to apply themselves to literary pursuits as an amusement; but he who advises any young friend to make it a profession by which he is to support himself, incurs a re-

sponsibility of no ordinary magnitude. The probabilities are in the proportion of a thousand to one that he is advising him to adopt a course which will render him miserable through life. It was the invariable practice of Sir Walter Scott to caution all young persons who submitted their maiden efforts to him, against trusting for their future support to their literary labours. I some time since saw a private letter from him to a young man of good talents and great literary enthusiasm, in which he most earnestly warned him against trusting for his bread to his literary labours, adding, that if he did so, he might consider it as all but certain that he was leaning on a broken reed.'

pp. 140—146.

There is, however, a bright side of the picture, and it is but fair that we should give it. Some men (alas, how few!) have gained handsome incomes, or amassed a princely fortune, as the following extract will show:—

'In the previous chapter I have spoken of the exceedingly precarious character of the literary profession. My observations, however, will not have been understood as applying in every case. They do apply in the vast majority of cases, but there are numerous exceptions. The case of Sir Walter Scott was an illustrious exception. His average income from his literary talents could not, for some years before his death, have been much short of £12,000: for he received £3,750 for permission to print an edition of 10,000 copies of several of his novels; and he ordinarily wrote three novels every year, besides his various contributions to periodicals. Byron, too, turned his genius to excellent pecuniary account. From first to last, it is understood that he received upwards of £20,000 from Mr. Murray for his works. Moore also used to derive a large income from his intellectual exertions. For his life and works of Lord Byron, he is said to have received from Mr. Murray £2,000. Mr. Murray is understood to have given £2,000 for the copyright of Washington Irving's '*Life of Columbus*.' For the first volume of Colonel Napier's '*History of the Peninsular War*,' the same publisher gave the gallant author the sum of 1,000 guineas. It is calculated that Southey derives an annual income of about £1,000 from his literary labours. There is no doubt, I believe, that Messrs. Baldwin and Cradock gave him last year £1,000 for his *Life, &c.* of Cowper. That literature has proved, and ever will prove a very lucrative profession to those who have most distinguished themselves in its higher walks, will appear from a statement of the prices which many authors have received for their works.

'Mr. Edward Lytton Bulwer got, if my information be correct, no less a sum than £1,600 for his '*Rienzi*,' from Messrs. Saunders and Otley, who have also paid him similar amounts for several of his other works. The same publishers gave Captain Marryat £1,000, or 1,000 guineas, I am not sure which, for his '*Japhet in Search of a Father*,' though the work had, in some measure, lost the freshness of novelty, through its previous appearance in the '*Metropolitan Magazine*.' Mr.



Galt always got from £200 to £300 for his novels ; and when any of them came to a second edition, he usually got something more.

‘ I could mention several other instances, in which other authors have received douceurs from publishers, when the works reached second or third editions ; but as the circumstance is by no means uncommon, it is unnecessary to refer particularly to individual cases. It is but right, however, to state, that this is, in some cases, more from considerations of good policy than from the mere impulses of a generous feeling. Publishers sometimes make authors presents of the kind referred to, as an inducement to write other works, of which they expect, of course, to have the publication. Let me mention one striking instance of genuine liberality on the part of the publisher to a successful author. Allan Cunningham was engaged to furnish Mr. Murray with six volumes of his ‘ *Lives of the British Painters,*’ &c., at £600, or £100 each volume, for the ‘ *Family Library.*’ He executed his task to the satisfaction of his employer and the public. Mr. Murray, on its great success, showed that he could appreciate merit by doubling his terms ; in other words, by giving Allan £1,200, instead of £600, exclusively of a handsomely bound set of the ‘ *Quarterly Review,*’ from the commencement of the work.

‘ I have mentioned the sum which Allan Cunningham received for the volumes which he furnished to Mr. Murray’s ‘ *Family Library.*’ For his ‘ *Life and Works of Burns,*’ in eight volumes, published by Messrs. Cochrane and Macrone, he got £800. Mr. Galt got from the same publishers, £250 for his ‘ *Autobiography.*’ The price which Mr. Robert Montgomery Martin received, from Mr. Cochrane, for his ‘ *History of the British Colonies,*’ in five volumes, was about £800. Mr. Cochrane gave very liberal remuneration to literary men in several other instances which have come under my own immediate observation ; but it is not necessary to allude to them in detail. Mr. Willis got £250 from Mr. Macrone, for his ‘ *Pencillings by the Way.*’ What Messrs. Saunders and Otley gave him for his ‘ *Inklings of Adventure,*’ I have not heard. The usual price of works of fiction, in three volumes, written by popular authors, has of late been from £200 to £300 : formerly it was higher ; but, as mentioned in the preceding chapter, the falling off in the demand for works of that class has been so great as to render it hazardous for publishers to offer a higher sum than the above. As it is, comparatively few, even of those written by novelists of distinguished reputation, obtain a remunerating sale. In two or three late instances, novelists of the first class have got as high as £500, but the publishers have been losers by the transaction. Illustrated works, got up in the style of the *Annuals*, have, in some recent cases, ‘ *fetched*’ a high price in the literary market. Captain Marryat, in 1835, received for his ‘ *Pirate,*’ in one volume, no less than £750, from Mr. Heath, who has brought out so many illustrated works. And Mr. Bulwer, if I remember rightly, got £800 for his ‘ *Pilgrims of the Rhine,*’ also in one volume.’—pp. 171—176.

The extravagant expectations of young authors are proverbial.

We are all apt to judge of others from ourselves, and what more natural than that we should expect from the public a prompt and decided approval of what we regard with so much complacency. But the revelation speedily comes, and woe be to the man who has not strong nerves, or a sound head. Our author supplies some amusing instances, but we can only make room for the following.

‘The late Mr. Johnson, of St. Paul’s Church-yard, a well-known publisher of religious works, used to tell a laughable anecdote illustrative of the extravagant notions which authors often entertain of the demand there will be for their works. A clergyman called on him, and said that he wished him to be the agent for a volume of sermons, price 10s. 6d., which he (the clergyman) had resolved on publishing on his own account. The bibliopole asked him how many copies he meant to throw off. ‘At least 10,000,’ replied the divine. The worthy publisher remonstrated, saying that 250 would be nearer the mark. ‘Two hundred and fifty!’ exclaimed the theologian, in a tone of stifled indignation at the censure cast on his professional acquirements, as he thought, by the observation. ‘Two hundred and fifty!’ Why there are at least 10,000 clergymen in the communion of the Church of England, and every one of them will have a copy. Get me 10,000 copies printed,’ said the divine, with an air of self-importance, ‘and if they are not all sold, I myself will have to sustain the loss alone.’ ‘Very well,’ said the publisher, and the parties bade each other good morning. The volume of divinity appeared, and continued to be advertised in all the magazines and papers for nearly six weeks. In about three months after the publication, the reverend author came to town (he was the rector of a parish in Yorkshire) with the sole view of balancing accounts with his bookseller, and receive the anticipated profits. A statement of accounts was demanded by the clergyman, and instantly furnished by the other. It was substantially as follows :

	£.	s.	d.
To printing and correcting . . . . .	246	0	0
To paper . . . . .	482	0	0
To boarding . . . . .	180	0	0
To advertising . . . . .	66	15	0
	<hr/>		
	974	15	0
The number of copies sold was 45, after deducting commission and allowance to the trade, amounting to . . . . .			
	15	15	0
	<hr/>		
Making the balance due by author to his agents, &c. . . . .	959	0	0

‘The rev. gentleman was quite horror-struck at this ‘statement of accounts.’ He declared himself a ruined man by the result of his publishing speculation. The worthy bibliopole, seeing he had fairly

convinced the divine how grossly he had over-rated the demand for books, told him the account he had submitted to him was drawn out agreeably to the number of the copies he had *ordered* to be printed; but that he, knowing better about such matters, had instructed the printer to throw off only 250 copies. A thousand blessings invoked on the head of Mr. Johnson, was the emphatic manner in which the reverend author expressed his obligations to his benefactor.' pp. 195—197.

Publishers have a difficult task to perform in determining on the merits, or rather (for this is their sole object) on the probable sale of manuscripts which they are invited to purchase. The leading houses have one or two 'literary men,' as they are technically called, to whose judgment such matters are referred; but these are sometimes found to differ in opinion, and what is then to be done? The following account is given by our author, on the authority of 'a gentleman who was personally privy to it.' The publisher referred to, as the account itself will show, had two 'literary men' in his employ.

'Some years since, a gentleman well known in the fashionable and military world, and who had in addition the magical appendage of an M.P. to his name, called on the bibliopole and begged to introduce to him a young gentleman, his friend. After the usual civilities had been exchanged, the latter stated the object of his visit was to see whether he and the bibliopole could come to any arrangement regarding the publication of a work which he had almost ready. Knowing that the young gentleman belonged to a respectable family residing in St. James's Square, and hearing him warmly eulogised for his literary taste by the gallant M.P. who introduced him, the bibliopole undertook the publication of the work, and to give £200 to the author without even seeing the manuscript. This was certainly an adventurous step on the part of the publisher, where the work was the author's maiden production. The author being in want of money, the bibliopole drew out a bill at once for the amount. In about a fortnight afterwards, the manuscript was sent to the publisher, and he handed it over to one of his literary men, with a request that he would read it carefully, and state his opinion of it; but without mentioning that he had already bought and paid for it. The gentleman called on the publisher some days afterwards, when the latter asked him whether he had read the manuscript.

'I have gone through the first volume,'\* said the literary gentleman.

'And what do you think of it?' said the bibliopole, eagerly. 'Favourably, I have no doubt.'

'The greatest trash, without exception, I ever read,' said the other.

---

\* The work was a fashionable novel in three volumes.



‘The vender of literature’ turned pale. He was quite confounded, and a few minutes elapsed before he was able to utter a word. ‘You don’t mean to say it’s *so* very bad,’ he at length stut-tered out.

‘It is, I assure you, the most consummate nonsense that ever soiled paper,’ observed the literary man.

‘The bibliopole rubbed his hands in an agony of mortification.

‘But perhaps, though deficient in literary merit, it may display a knowledge of high life, and consequently sell,’ he observed, after a momentary silence.

‘A knowledge of high life!’ exclaimed the other, making a wry face; ‘why, if we may judge from the style and sentiments of the work, the author knows no more about high life than if his occupation were to sweep the crossings.’\*

‘The bibliopole thrust his hands into his smallclothes pockets, and made two or three hasty paces through the apartment.

‘But you have not read the whole through: possibly if you finish the manuscript you may think better of it,’ said the patron of literature, as he loves to be considered.

‘Read the whole through!’ exclaimed the literary man, ‘why I would not wade through the other two volumes for fifty pounds. It is, you may depend upon it, the most unadulterated nonsense that ever emanated from the human mind.’

‘The bibliopole looked at a heap of papers which lay on the table, scratched his head, and then muttered out, ‘Well, bring me back the manuscript, if you please.’

‘The literary man quitted the place, and the poor publisher was left to ruminate on the folly, as he now thought it, of buying a pig in a poke. He vowed in his own mind that he would never afterwards purchase any work of an unknown author, without first examining the manuscript. But what was to be done touching the £200? The loss of the money haunted him like a spectre. While reproaching himself as the greatest fool in Christendom, his other ‘literary man’ chanced to drop in. A thought struck the bibliopole. ‘Good morning, Mr. Thompson.’

‘Good morning, sir,’ responded the other.

‘A gentleman has promised to send me the manuscript of a fashionable novel. Will you set to work and read it carefully through as soon as you can, and let me know your opinion of it.’

‘Certainly,’ said Mr. Thompson.

‘I expect it here every minute,’ said the vender of literature. ‘I will send it to your house the moment it comes, as I am quite impatient to know what you think of it.’

‘It shall have my immediate and best attention,’ remarked Mr. Thompson.

---

\* In order that the judgment of these literary men may be un-biassed, the publishers always conceal the name of the author of the manuscript.

'The manuscript was forwarded to the latter, and carefully examined. His opinion of it was the very reverse of that of the other 'literary man.' He pronounced it the best work of fiction he had ever read, and assured the bibliopole he had been entranced by it, and that it would create a great sensation among the higher classes, with whose habits the author manifested a most intimate acquaintance.

'The patron of literature was now thrown into a state of utter perplexity. 'Who shall decide when doctors differ?' was a remark he had often heard before, but the full force of which he had never until now experienced in his own person. To lose his £200 was an evil of no ordinary magnitude; but it would be a less evil than the loss of £500 or £600 by printing and advertising a book which would not sell. If, therefore, both his 'literary men' had concurred in condemning the work, he would have consented to the loss of his £200, on the principle of choosing the least of two evils. Here, however, their opinions as to the merits of the book were the very antipodes of each other. If the judgment of the first literary man were correct, the loss incurred by the publication would be enormous; if that of the other were sound, the bibliopole must make a little fortune by the work. To what decision, then, was the perplexed publisher to come? He waddled through the room, knit his brow, and heaved two or three broken sighs, as he thought of the dilemma in which he was placed. He had often experienced the sorrows of a publisher before; but here were sorrows of a new class, or to use his own words, a 'new series.' He thought with himself that if the unknown poet who begins his touching lines, 'Pity the sorrows of a poor old man!' had been alive at the time, and been aware of his distressing perplexity, he would have made it—'Pity the sorrows of a bibliopole!' While in this pitiable state, an acquaintance of mine, who was in the confidence of the publisher, chanced to call on him. 'O, Mr. Thomas, I'm so glad you're come!' he exclaimed, as the other entered his room.

'What's the matter?' said the latter.

'O, these two rascals of readers! (another of his terms), what a couple of vagabonds they are!' he answered.

'What have they done?' inquired Mr. Thomas.

'Why, the one pronounces a fashionable novel I have given him to read to be the most arrant trash ever penned, and says the author knows nothing of fashionable life; while the other represents the work as the best he ever read, and says the writer displays a most intimate acquaintance with the habits of the higher classes.'

'Well, that is differing with a vengeance, certainly!' said Mr. Thomas.

'It is, indeed,' observed the literary merchant; 'and what am I to do between the two rogues?'

'Stop a moment,' said Mr. Thomas, putting his hand to his head, and looking thoughtfully. 'Stop a moment! I think I know how you may decide at once as to whose judgment is to be relied on.'

'By what means can I decide the point?' said the bibliopole eagerly, his little countenance brightening up as he spoke.

'Of course you know the author?' said Mr. Thomas.

‘ ‘O yes, certainly,’ replied the perplexed publisher.

‘ ‘Then you must know whether he be a man accustomed to move in the higher circles of society ; and as the one literary man affirms that he knows nothing of the manners of the upper classes, while the other says he evinces a most intimate acquaintance with fashionable life, the fair presumption is that the one who is right as to that point, is also right as to the literary merits of the work.’

‘ ‘Bless me ! I never thought of that,’ said the publisher, overjoyed at the discovery of Mr. Thomas, and amazed at his own stupidity in not having made it himself.

‘ ‘The literary man who pronounced the work to be one of transcendent merit, having been the party who expressed his conviction that the writer was in the habit of mixing with the upper classes of society, the bibliopole, of course, at once determined on publication. The work appeared ; it made a great noise, and the author is now one of the most popular writers of the day.’ pp. 227—236.

We must limit ourselves to one more extract, which we shall take from our author’s account of the Stock Exchange. Such of our readers as have ever ventured within the walls of that most noisy and uproarious place, where the frolics of boyhood are strangely blended with the deepest and most hazardous speculations, will never forget either the scene or their reception. The facility with which large fortunes have been made and lost on the Stock Exchange exceed the most marvellous tales of romance. Let the following suffice, as an example :

‘ As illustrative of the sudden and singular vicissitudes of fortune which men sometimes undergo in that place, I may mention a curious instance in the case of Mr. F——, the present proprietor of one of the most extensive estates in the county of Middlesex. He had been for some years a member of the Stock Exchange, when, on becoming unfortunate, he had to suffer the indignity of having his name chalked on the black board ; an indignity to which poverty more frequently than dishonourable conduct is subjected. The loss of a handsome fortune, coupled with the treatment he had received from the committee, worked his feelings up to such a state of frenzy, that chancing to pass London Bridge a few days after the battle of Waterloo, he, in his despair, threw the last shilling he had in the world over the bridge into the water. For a few moments afterwards he stood motionless on the spot, leaning over the parapet, and gazing vacantly on the water. The emotions which then passed through his mind were of a nature which no second party could describe ; and which, indeed, even he himself could not by possibility convey with anything like their vividness or power, to the minds of others. His predominating feelings—but no idea can be formed of their burning intensity—were those of envy of the insensate stones, and of a wish that he himself were, like his last shilling, at the bottom of the river. That moment, but for the crowds of persons who were passing and repassing, he would have thrown himself over the parapet of the bridge, and ended his woes



by ending his existence. From that instant, he did form the purpose of committing suicide; and he began to move slowly towards home with that view. Before he had reached the other end of the bridge, he was met by a Frenchman with whom he had been on terms of great intimacy. He would have passed by the Frenchman, so absorbed was he with the wretchedness of his condition, without recognizing him. The latter, however, advancing towards Mr. F——, seized him by the hand, and inquired how he was. He managed to lisp out an ‘O, how are you?’

‘‘This is a most important affair to both countries,’ said the Frenchman.

‘‘What affair?’ inquired the other, partially recovering himself from the frightful reverie to which he had been giving way.

‘‘Why, the great battle,’ observed Monsieur.

‘‘The great battle! What great battle?’

‘‘The battle of Waterloo.’

‘‘You are surely dreaming. I have not heard a word about it: the newspapers make no mention of any battle having been lately fought.’

‘‘I dare say they do not. How could they? Intelligence of it has only reached town within the last two hours. The foreign secretary and the French ambassador alone know anything of it. Government have received the tidings of it by telegraph: it is not an hour since I parted with the French ambassador from whom I had the information. Napoleon is signally defeated.’

Mr. F—— felt as if he had started from a deep sleep. He felt as if he had become a new man. The advantage to which such important intelligence might be turned on the Stock Exchange, the scene of so many disasters and so much degradation to him, immediately shot across his mind.

‘‘And the battle was an important one?’

‘‘Most important,’ said the Frenchman, with great emphasis. ‘It will prove fatal for ever to the prospects of Buonaparte. His usurpation is at an end,’ he added, with evident joy, being a great adherent of the Bourbon family.

‘‘Were the numbers on either side great?’

‘‘I have no idea of the exact numbers, but the battle was the greatest which has been fought in modern times, and it lasted a considerable part of three days.’

Mr. F—— cordially shook the Frenchman by the hand, and said he would call on him in a day or two. Hastily returning to the city, he hurried to a certain firm on the Stock Exchange, informed them that he had just become exclusively possessed of most important information, and expressed his readiness to communicate it to them on condition that he should receive the half of whatever profits they might realize on any operation they might have in the Stock Exchange in consequence of that information. They agreed to his proposal: he told them the result of the battle of Waterloo: they rushed into the market and purchased consols to an enormous amount. In the meantime Mr. F—— proceeded to another large house, and told them also

that he possessed information of the most important character, of which he was sure they had heard nothing. They admitted they knew of nothing that was not in the public prints. He made the same proposal to them he had done to the other firm: they also, not supposing Mr. F—— had spoken to any other party on the subject, at once closed with the offer, and, on the intelligence being communicated to them, one of the partners called the other aside—there were only two in the counting-house at the time—and whispered to him, not on any account to let Mr. F—— out of his sight, lest he should allow the important intelligence to transpire to some one else,—adding that he would that instant hurry to the Stock Exchange, and employ various brokers to purchase consols to a large amount. ‘You’ll recollect what I have said,’ he observed to his partner, as he hastened out of the counting-house. ‘I’ll take special care of that,’ said the other. ‘Leave such matters to me,’ he added in his own mind. A thought struck him. ‘Mr. F——, will you just step into the parlour,’ pointing the way, ‘and have a lunch?’ Mr. F. assented. They both proceeded to an apartment in another part of the house. A lunch was brought. Mr. F——, whose state of mind had deprived him of all appetite for some days past, now ate rather heartily. While busy with the things set before him, the other, rising from his seat, said, ‘You’ll excuse me for a moment, Mr. F——, while I transact a small matter in the counting-house.’ ‘Certainly,’ said Mr. F——, ‘take your time.’ The other quitted the room, and, on getting to the outside, locked the door, unknown to Mr. F——, and put the key in his pocket. In about half an hour the first partner returned from the Stock Exchange, and stated that the funds had already, from some cause or other, risen in an hour or two three per cent. The cause, it is unnecessary to say, was the immense amount of consols which had been purchased by the first house to whom Mr. F—— gave the information. Both partners proceeded to the apartment in which they had shut up their prisoner, and apprised him of the rise which had taken place, adding that they did not think it advisable to purchase at the advanced price. He urged them to do so, expressing his firm belief that when the news of so important a victory by the allied powers had been received, the funds would rise at least ten or twelve per cent. The parties acted on his advice, and made immense purchases. The event justified the soundness of Mr. F——’s counsel, and the accuracy of his opinion; for on the day on which intelligence of the battle was made general, the funds rose to the amazing extent of fifteen per cent., which is the greatest rise they were ever known to experience. Mr. F——’s share of the profits between the two houses in one day exceeded £100,000. He returned next day to the Stock Exchange, and very soon amassed a large fortune, when he had the wisdom to quit the place for ever, and went and purchased the estate I have alluded to, which he still possesses.’ Vol. II. pp. 64—71.

We have been so much pleased in the perusal of these volumes as to be wholly indisposed to the task of minor criticism. We have detected a few inaccuracies in the statement of facts,

and have occasionally regretted the want of severe revision in matters of style. But these are mere trifles, not unworthy, indeed, of our author's notice, but wholly beside the general merits of his work. We should be doing injustice to our own feelings if we did not, in closing, express our warm commendation of the more than respectful feeling towards Divine revelation which his pages evince. He never loses an appropriate opportunity of doing homage to religion. Instead of shrinking from the avowal of his sentiments, he glories in their utterance, and there is a freshness and warm-heartedness in his remarks which bespeak his sincerity.

It is unnecessary formally to recommend his volumes. The extracts we have made will attract more purchasers than any panegyric we could pen.

Art. IV. *Rienzi; or the Last of the Tribunes.* By the Author of 'Pelham.' 3 vols. London: Saunders & Otley, 1836.

THE history of every mental process is interesting. To observe how opinions grow into principles, and how the latter are brought to bear upon the conduct of individuals or societies, is neither more nor less, than philosophy teaching by examples. It is in this view alone, that the annals of man possess greater value than those of the Cranes and Pigmies, or the Frogs and Mice of antiquity. The volume of past ages should always be opened to lay bare the curious springs of motive and action; whereby it will be seen, that although leading ideas are constantly re-producing themselves, yet on the whole, a perpetual struggle to get right acts as the universal momentum, bearing forward mankind in masses, from one degree of improvement to another. Kings may seem to crush, aristocracies to domineer, and priests to delude, for periods comparatively protracted: but alternations of light as well as darkness, relieve the dreariest scenes. What is wrong carries within itself the seeds of its own dissolution. Truth and freedom and love are the real immortals, which will survive both the shocks of violence, and the silent canker of decay.

Reformers in all times have risen up to declare these things, and protest against existing abuses: but because the consul Crescentius, or Arnold of Brescia, became bonfires for a mob at Rome, superficial observers imagine them to have been madmen, or at the best, useless enthusiasts. Madame de Stäel speaks, in her *Corinne*, of those 'Qui ont pris les souvenirs pour les espérances:' and there is much point as well as some truth in the expression. Yet it should be remembered, that no effort made in a right direction can be lost. An impulse is given, of which the



ulterior consequences may be developed upon a surprising scale; and Chateaubriand is correct in declaring that the earliest revolution in the world will be found to have told, in some mysterious and invisible manner, upon the last. Occasionally, two or three stages of the operation may be discerned: as for example, in the influence of Wycliffe's writings upon John Huss and Jerome of Prague; and again, in the manner in which they opened the way for Luther and his fellow-labourers. Or looking back upon political affairs, it may strike most persons that the French Revolution was precipitated by that in America; which last, in the New England and Middle States at least, felt to no slight extent the puritanism of the previous century. And thus it happens that each event forms but one link of a vast and sublime concatenation, while, from age to age, some master-hand, or some wonderful change of circumstances, communicates a tone to the whole,

‘Striking the electric chain wherewith we are darkly bound!’

Rome in the Middle Ages furnished a remarkable illustration of this in the instance of Nicola di Rienzi, the son of an inn-keeper and a washerwoman. The causes of that temporary success, which has so dazzled the imagination of patriots and poets from Petrarch's time to our own day, may be sought for in four sources: the historical associations cherished by the Romans even during their deepest degeneracy; the Paulician doctrines still existing in Italy; the residence of the popes at Avignon; and the grinding oppression of a lawless aristocracy.

In fact, what the senses are to the soul, external objects are to the senses. The peasants in Switzerland are proud of their Alps and glaciers, just as the same class of persons in Sicily are of the volcanic phenomena of Etna, or the majestic ruins at Giogenti. We see something of the same sort even amongst ourselves, from Shakespeare's Cliff at Dover, to the few but interesting reminiscences so fondly cherished by the good towns-people at Stratford-upon-Avon. But what are any or all such associations compared with those, which hover over the Seven Hills and the Tiber? Mean and base and degraded as the successive races of inhabitants at Rome became, an appeal to the mighty monuments around them would always awaken ten thousand emotions, the more powerful from their being blended with the marvels of superstition. Their confused ideas, moreover, as to the real state of things in by-gone days, added to the general exaggeration, with which all are too prone to reflect or descant upon the past. No one can have investigated a volume of Muratori's *Antiquities*, or his *Scriptores Rerum Italicarum*, or have read a page of Poggio's lugubrious lucubrations, without perceiving that this was the case. The correspondence of the Bard of Vaucluse remarkably

confirms it. Monks and cardinals agree in their dull yet faithful testimony to the point. Tradition, like the spectre of the Hartz Mountains, always overawed, and sometimes scared an uninformed, and therefore credulous population. It was the magician rarely visible, but ever present in his spell and influences, to which every orator appealed, whenever an unpopular prelate was to be deposed, or a barbarian emperor to be kept at a respectful distance. The fallen marbles of the forum had a tongue or an echo, which spoke to the heart of the departed, though not forgotten, freedom and grandeur, they had once witnessed; and hence no names were more dear to the successors of the S. P. Q. R. than such official titles as Senator, Prefect, Consul, and Tribune.

Added to these considerations, it must be remembered that the Paulician doctrines were by no means extinct in Italy during the fourteenth century. Persecution proved a severe but most useful friend to mankind. She it was who so helped to scatter the seeds of truth, like 'bread cast upon the waters to be found 'after many days.' From Tephrike, in Asia, to Bulgaria, and following the source of the Danube even to the confines of Lombardy, round the head of the Adriatic, fire and sword pursued those flying sectaries, who presumed to think for themselves, and defy an Established Church. Amidst much that was fanatical and erroneous, they retained an indomitable attachment to the rights of conscience, and appear to have been the progenitors of the Albigenses, as well as of those who followed Arnold of Brescia and his disciples. Under various names of reproach, they excited the bitterness of inquisitors to a very late period; and that too amidst such intensity of scorn and hatred, as to be a powerful witness, not merely to their numbers, but to the effects produced by their opinions. Those opinions spread like wildfire, and undermined or overcame the prejudices of orthodoxy in multitudes, who found it impossible to close their eyes against abuses no longer to be concealed. The pen of Petrarch, and the genius of Dante, bewailed and lashed a herd of vices, which needed sterner remedies for their removal. Had printing, however, been then discovered, there is no saying how far the religious heroes of Wittemburg and Zurich might have been anticipated in Italy, or even in the Babylon of Christendom. Men were beginning to prepare for a change; although generations had still to elapse, before the golden moment would arrive.

The residence of the popes at Avignon formed a third circumstance favourable to the revolution effected by Rienzi. Bitter were the complaints on this score of every Christian country, with perhaps the single exception of France. Contemporaneous writers are fond of comparing it with the seventy years captivity of the children of Israel. Yet the representatives of St. Peter could urge very strong grounds for having transported the Apos-

tolie See from the tumults of Rome to the comparative tranquillity of the Venaissin. During a previous century they had withdrawn to Anagni, Perugia, Viterbo, and the adjacent cities; and whenever from these quiet but obscure stations they were induced to re-visit the Vatican, a reception, graphically described by Matthew Paris, too surely awaited them: *Romani autem non valentes nec volentes ultra suam celare cupiditatem gravissimam contra Papam movere cæperunt quæstionem, exigentes ab eo urgentissime omnia quæ subierant per ejus absentiam damna et jacturas, videlicet in hospitibus locandis, in mercimoniis, in usuris, in redditibus, in provisionibus, et in aliis modis innumerabilibus. Quod cum audisset Papa, præcordaliter ingemuit!* Hist. p. 757. Bernard, the Abbot of Clairvaux, tells the same story; and, in speaking of the Romans, his oratorical qualifications might suit our Exeter Hall on certain *Catholic* occasions: 'Who is ignorant,' says he, 'of the vanity and arrogance of the Romans? a nation nursed in sedition, cruel, untractable, and scorning to obey, unless when too feeble to resist. When they promise to serve, they aspire to reign; if they swear allegiance, they watch the opportunity of revolt: yet they vent their discontent in loud clamours, if your doors or councils are shut against them. Dexterous in mischief, they have never learnt the science of doing good. Odious to earth and heaven, impious to God, seditious among themselves, jealous of their neighbours, inhuman to strangers, they love no one, by no one are they beloved; and while they wish to inspire fear, they live in base and continual apprehension. They will not submit; they know not how to govern; faithless to their superiors, intolerable to their equals, ungrateful to their benefactors, and alike imprudent in their demands and their refusals. Lofty in promise, poor in execution: adulation and calumny, perfidy and treason, are the familiar arts of their policy.' Gibbon, chap. lxix. Petrarch cites the passage; which although dark in its colouring, marvellously illustrates the narrative of Rienzi. Matters naturally grew rather worse than better, when their sovereign bishop appeared to have abandoned them for ever; and the populace was ripe for revolt, so soon as the opportunity should offer.

Nor was the desirableness of some change diminished, through the oppressions of that lawless aristocracy, which scourged without mercy all Italy in general, and its fallen capital in particular. 'They laughed at the authority of the magistrate within and without the walls. It was no longer a civil contention between the nobles and plebeians for the government of the state. The barons asserted in arms their personal independence. Their palaces and castles were fortified against a siege, and their private quarrels were maintained by the number of their vassals.' Passing over the famous Frangipani, the Corsi, the Savelli, the



Conti, and the Annibaldi, history in the age of Rienzi, has most concern with the rival houses of Colonna and Orsini. Their hereditary feud distracted for above 250 years the ecclesiastical state. The latter were Guelphs, the former Ghibellines. 'The eagle and the keys,' says Gibbon, 'were displayed in their adverse banners; and the two factions of Italy most furiously raged, when the origin and nature of the dispute were long since forgotten. After the retreat of the popes to Avignon, they disputed in arms the vacant republic; and the mischiefs of discord were perpetuated by the wretched compromise of electing each year two rival senators. By their private hostilities the city and country were desolated; and the fluctuating balance inclined with their alternate success.' It may well be imagined, that such a dispute could be productive of nothing beside suffering to the unfortunate people. Whichever party culminated, there was no relief for them. The honest burgher was crushed between the mail of contending barons, or fleeced with the ruthless shears which the church demurely carried under her mantle. Yet the oppressed had natural rights and natural feelings, as well as the oppressor. To have spoken out singly, or until protected by powerful combinations, would have insured any man the honour of being exalted upon the nearest gallows; and that with as little delay as possible. A mine, therefore, of public discontent accumulated in secret, until a very humble hand set fire to the train; and Rienzi availed himself of the explosion, to immortalize his name, in attempting deliverance for his country.

Nicola di Rienzi, as before mentioned, was a person in lowly life; though his father is said to have been an illegitimate son of the emperor, Henry VII., of the great house of Luxemburgh. Gabrini was the patronymic of his family. Having a taste for literature, he contrived to indulge it, and obtained access to manuscripts of many among the classics of antiquity; from whose pages he illuminated his own mind, and instructed his contemporaries. The associations around him all fanned the flames. When wandering amidst the monuments of the Via Sacra he would exclaim, 'Where are now these Romans? their virtue, their justice, their power? Why was I not born in happier times?' His friends listened, applauded, and multiplied; and a circumstance moreover had occurred, which exercised considerable influence on his mind. His younger brother having been murdered by some baronial ruffians in a fray, he loudly demanded justice from the Colonna, in whose palace he was allowed through his talents, to be an occasional guest. But a member of that family turned out to have been the guilty party; and what were a few drops of plebeian blood, when shed by a noble hand? His patron would have befriended him, had the villain been on any other side than his own; but as it was, Rienzi addressed his bitter sup-

plications to ears of adamant. This incident very appropriately forms the first chapter in these volumes; nor has their ingenious author failed to display his powers in describing the lonely walk along the banks of the Tiber; the attempts of two parties, one to protect and the other to detain a corn-vessel laden with supplies for a fortress up the river; the ferocious attack and subsequent flight of the Orsini, the slaughter of the fugitives, and the death of the unfortunate boy, whose fraternal protector (the future Tribune of Rome) witnesses his fate, and vainly sues for retribution.

‘From that bloody clay, and that inward prayer, Cola di Rienzi rose a new being. With his young brother died his own youth. But for that event, the future deliverer of Rome might have been but a dreamer, a scholar, a poet,—the peaceful rival of Petrarch, a man of thoughts, not deeds. But from that time, all his faculties, energies, fancies, genius, became concentrated to a single point; and patriotism, before a vision, leapt into the life and vigour of a passion, lastingly kindled, stubbornly hardened, and awfully desecrated—by revenge!’

Vol. I., p. 24.

About this period, Italy, through the recklessness of her nobles, was overrun with robbers, equally flagitious with themselves, and only proscribed by the law, whenever it could catch and gibbet them with comparative impunity. They were in fact neither more nor less than baronial mercenaries, selling their swords to the best bidders, but governed by their own leaders, and forming *an order* by themselves. In other words, they were the Ishmaelites of the age—an ambulatory aristocracy,—too proud, for the most part, to veil their crimes under sounding titles, and too powerful to regard social institutions. Their employers had but one vice more than themselves,—and that was hypocrisy. Froissart frequently alludes to the privileged classes of the Grand Companies, blending as they did all denominations into one. ‘Poor rogues,’ says the amusing chronicler, ‘took advantage of these times, and robbed both towns and castles; so that some of them, becoming rich, constituted themselves captains of bands of thieves. There were some among them worth 40,000 crowns. Their method was to mark out particular towns or castles, a day or two’s journey from each other. They then collected twenty or thirty robbers, and travelling through bye-roads in the night time, entered the place they had fixed upon about day-break, and set one of the houses on fire.’ chap. 146. Booty and beauty were of course their main objects; and heavy was the black-mail paid by friar and peasant for what was termed their protection. A personage, styling himself Duke Werner, had got together a larger pack of such wolves than any of his contemporaries in Italy, with whom he carried terror from one end

of the Peninsula to the other. His successor in fame and prowess was the celebrated Walter de Montreal, a gentleman of Provence, and Knight of St. John of Jerusalem; who contrived to engraft the poetry of his native vallies upon the barbarism of his wild vocation. His character and actions are finely interwoven by Mr. Bulwer with those of Rienzi. Both were ambitious; the patriot to save his country; the warrior to aggrandize himself. The former, brooding over the past, maintained that Rome was still *de jure* the mistress of the world, with that liberty for her rightful dower, of which he was resolved to attempt the restoration. The latter, under similar hallucinations as to the pretensions and destinies of the Eternal City, dreamt of nothing less than enthroning his own fortunes within her walls, upon the ruins both of the aristocracy and the people; in whose approaching collision he was therefore desirous of taking an active share. The one meditated an appeal to mind, and the other to force, for the attainment of his several purposes. Nor is the author less accurate in adhering to the realities of history, than he is skilful in softening their harder outlines, and throwing into contrast the fierce frankness of the soldier, with the mingled artfulness and fanaticism of the Cromwell of the fourteenth century.

‘For nothing,’ as he observes, ‘ever so inspires human daring, as the fond belief that it is the agent of a Diviner wisdom. Revenge and patriotism, united in one man of genius, and ambition,—such are the Archimedian levers, that find in fanaticism, the spot out of the world, by which to move the world. The prudent man directs a state; but it is the enthusiast who regenerates it, or ruins.’—Vol. I., p. 124.

The task which Rienzi undertook was indeed gigantic. It was no less than to declare war against those who worshipped the blood-stained sword by which they lived and rioted. It was no less than to elevate the level of an entire generation by his almost unassisted efforts; to burst asunder those bonds which ignorance and oppression had riveted in Cyclopien forges; to present freedom and prosperity to a populace too corrupt to defend the first, even though they clamoured for it; and far too excitable, yet pusillanimous, to know how to preserve and profit by the last. The leading noble at Rome was old Stephen Colonna, whose portrait is well set before the reader, in the following description:—

‘At a table, bearing the implements of writing, sat the old Colonna; a robe of rich furs and velvet hung loose upon his tall and stately frame; from a round skull-cap of comforting warmth and crimson hue, a few grey locks descended, and mixed with a long and reverend beard. The countenance of the aged noble, who had long passed his eightieth year, still retained the traces of a comeliness, for which in earlier manhood he was remarkable. His eyes, if deep-sunken, were



still dark and lively, and sparkled with all the fire of youth; his mouth curved upward in a pleasant, though half satiric smile; and his appearance, on the whole, was prepossessing and commanding, indicating rather the high-blood, the shrewd wit, and the gallant valour of the patrician, than his craft, hypocrisy, and habitual, but disdainful spirit of oppression.—Vol. I., p. 182.

To oppose such a leader, in such an age, required just that combination of qualities, which perhaps at that time could alone have been discovered in Rienzi. There is no doubt, but that his motives were, upon the whole, as pure as the state of things, in so unenlightened a period, would allow; but the following remarks may well be weighed and remembered:

‘However august be the object we propose to ourselves, every less worthy path we take to insure it, distorts the mental sight of our ambition; and the means by degrees abase the end to their own standard. This is the true misfortune of a man nobler than his age—that the instruments he must use soil himself: half he reforms his times; but half too the times will corrupt the reformer. His own craft undermines his safety;—the people, whom he himself accustoms to a false excitement, perpetually crave it; and when their ruler ceases to seduce their fancy, he falls their victim. The reform he makes by these means is hollow and momentary,—it is swept away with himself;—it was but the trick,—the show,—the wasted genius of a conjuror: the curtain falls—the magic is over—the cup and balls are kicked aside. Better one slow step in enlightenment,—which being made by the reason of a whole people, cannot recede,—than those sudden flashes in the depth of the general night, which the darkness, by contrast doubly dark, swallows up everlastingly again.’—Vol. I., pp. 250—1.

Walter de Montreal was now illustrating his chivalry by turning foresight and selfishness to the best possible account. Like a cormorant, he watched the surface of the waters, as Rienzi stirred their profoundest depths with his popular eloquence. The addresses of the orator were not merely made to the ear but to the eye. He threw a voice into every fragment—every mouldering column—every moss-grown architrave and pedestal, from the Vatican to the Palatine. Borrowing also a hint from the religious mysteries of the church, he exhibited allegorical pictures in the streets and public places; which furnished him at once with a text and commentary for the most forcible appeals to his auditories. He had now emerged from the obscurity attendant upon his birth and circumstances. He had been selected as one of thirteen deputies to Avignon, who, in company with the other orders of the state, implored the holy father to return to the seat of the apostles. With readiness and ability he delivered an harangue before the papal court, which, partly from Clement VI.’s admiration, and partly through the friendship of Petrarch,

procured him the appointment of notary to the Sacred See. Up to that hour, he is said to have subsisted upon the charity of the hospital, and to have possessed but one garment in his wardrobe. The salary attached to his office therefore made him a rich man; and while in the receipt of five golden florins a day, he was also in that post of observation, which enabled him to survey the heart of Christendom, and discern both its strength and weakness. With clear perception he saw from the very first, that he must associate the church with himself in his designs. He, therefore, professed himself her zealous servant, and promoted with all his influence reformation in the collection of her revenues, and their application to the general weal.

Boniface VIII. had instituted, as is well known, the Roman Jubilee, in imitation of the Secular Games, at the close of the previous century. Flocks of pilgrims had on that occasion resorted to the tomb of the apostles; and so replenished their successor's treasury, that 'two priests stood night and day, with rakes 'in their hands, to collect without counting, the heaps of gold and 'silver, that were poured on the altar of St. Paul.' Clement VI. fell in with the wishes of his Italian subjects, and anticipated the inconvenient delay of a hundred years, by the substitution of the Mosaic term. His bulls, therefore, announced the festival for A.D. 1350; so that it became an important object in A.D. 1347, to convince the Christian world, that the roads were free from violence, and that devotees would be received in safety at the pontifical metropolis. To do this, it was as necessary, as it was politic and popular, to enforce order throughout the country, and peace in the city; in other words, to repress the license of the two robber classes—the nobles, and the Grand Companies. Rienzi seized the opportunity. He secured a connivance, however reluctant, at his plans, from the Bishop of Orvieto, vicar of St. Peter's patrimony, by representations of the incalculable advantages which would accrue to the papal exchequer, through curbing the barons and their retainers. Similar statements found an echo among the middle classes, whose trade and commercial existence must depend on peace at all seasons; but whose augmented profits from the jubilee would be seriously affected by its attendant circumstances. The populace fell in with the mingled motives of superstition and excitement. Their fondness for shows and processions remained unabated. They listened with greediness to Rienzi. His satires and lampoons, so unsparingly heaped upon their tyrants, fed a natural passion. His flattery towards themselves of course gratified their pride, and animated their hopes that deliverance might be at hand. The fragments of the ancient *Lex Regia*, whereby a fawning senate had conferred upon Vespasian his imperial prerogatives, furnished the patriot with an occasion to descant upon the legal source of power as irrevocably

resident in the people. The original copper-plate was displayed in the church of St. John, in the Lateran, and thither all ranks were invited to hear a political lecture. The democratic notary appeared in a magnificent and mysterious habit, and evoked by his explanations the preliminary murmurs of the storm. On that night Walter de Montreal was accidentally led to a lonely spot, where, as to what he witnessed, we are thus informed :

‘ The Provençal stood, though he knew it not, on the very spot once consecrated by the temple—the portico—and library of Liberty,—the first public library instituted at Rome. The wall of the ruin was covered with innumerable creepers and wild brushwood, and it required but little agility on the part of Montreal, by the help of these, to raise himself to the height of the aperture, and concealed by the luxuriant foilage, to gaze within. He saw a table lighted with tapers, in the centre of which was a crucifix ; a dagger unsheathed ; an open scroll, which the event proved to be of sacred character ; and a brazen bowl. About a hundred men in cloaks, and with black vizards, stood motionless around ; and one taller than the rest, without disguise or mask—whose pale brow and stern features seemed by that light yet paler,—and yet more stern—appeared to be concluding some address to his companions.

‘ Yes,’ said he, ‘ in the church of the Lateran I will make the last appeal to the people. Supported by the vicar of the pope, myself an officer of the pontiff, it will be seen that Religion and Liberty—the heroes and the martyrs,—are united in one cause. After that time, words are idle ; action must begin. By this crucifix I pledge my faith—on this blade I devote my life—to the regeneration of Rome ! And you, (then no need for mask or mantle) when the solitary trump is heard—when the solitary horseman is seen—you swear to rally round the standard of the Republic, and resist with heart and hand, with life and soul, in defiance of death, and in hope of redemption—the arms of the oppressor !’

‘ We swear—we swear !’ exclaimed every voice—and crowding towards cross and weapon, the tapers were obscured by the intervening throng, and Montreal could not perceive the ceremony, nor hear the muttered formula of the oath ; but he could guess that the rite, then common to conspirators, and which required each conspirator to shed some drops of his own blood, in token that life itself was devoted to the enterprise, had not been omitted, when the group again receding, the same figure, as before had addressed the meeting, holding on high the bowl with both his hands,—while from the left arm, which was bared, the blood weltered slowly, and trickled drop by drop upon the ground,—said in a solemn voice, and with upturned eyes : ‘ Amidst the ruins of thy temple, O Liberty, we Romans dedicate to thee this libation. We, befriended and inspired by no unreal and fabled idols, but by the Lord of Hosts, and Him, who descending to earth, appealed not to emperors and princes, but to the fisherman and the peasant,—giving to the lowly and the poor the mission of revelation.’ Then turning suddenly to his companions, as his features irregularly varying



in their character and expression, brightened from solemn awe into a martial and kindling enthusiasm, he cried aloud, 'Death to the Tyranny!' 'Life to the Republic!' The effect of the transition was startling. Each man, as by an involuntary and irresistible impulse, laid his hand upon his sword, as he echoed the sentiment; some indeed drew forth their blades, as if for instant action.'—Vol. I., pp. 170—3.

Nor were the conspirators faithless to their adjuration. On the evening of the next day, agreeably to a summons affixed on the church-door of St. George, the populace, led on by a blacksmith, named Cecco del Vecchio, awaited the apparition of the horseman, and the sound of the solitary trumpet. The moment came—the signal was given—and the result proved more than answerable to expectation. Through an intrigue with Walter de Montreal, who was overreached by the better knowledge of his rival, the principal barons were absent with their mercenaries from the city. Vast multitudes of the populace then assembled as they had been required, without arms; but with their minds ready to ignite, when the torch should be applied. It was for the re-establishment of the *Buono Stato* that they were gathered together; and while their enthusiasm was kept up to the boiling-point, thirty masses were performed before the altar to the honour of the Holy Ghost. In the morning, Rienzi and his accomplices, issued forth from the sanctuary amidst all that pomp and circumstance, which at once excites and overawes. He walked bare-headed; but with that exception, in complete and costly armour. The Bishop of Orvieto was on his right hand; borne along by the current of events, and the impulses of his own powerful colleague. Three banners waved in the air with appropriate emblems; one of Liberty, in which the seat of the Cæsars was personified by a female figure, holding a globe and triumphal palm over two lions; another of Justice, in which St. Paul extended a naked sword; and a third of Concord, in which St. Peter with his keys asserted his apostolical supremacy. Toward the capitol the procession slowly moved, amidst *vivas*, which rent the air; and from the balcony above the grand staircase, the Liberator of Rome promulgated a constitution to the people: 'It created, or rather re-  
'vived with new privileges and powers—a representative assembly of councillors. It proclaimed as the first law, one that  
'seems simple enough to our happier times, but hitherto never  
'executed at Rome—every wilful homicide, of whatever rank,  
'was to be punished by death. It enacted that no private noble  
'or citizen should be suffered to maintain fortifications and garri-  
'sons in the city or country; that the gates and bridges of the  
'state should be under the control of whomsoever should be  
'chief-magistrate. It forbade all harbour of brigands, mercen-  
'aries, or robbers, on penalty of a thousand marks of silver; and  
'it made the barons, who possessed the neighbouring territories,

‘responsible for the safety of the roads, and the transport of merchandise. It took under the protection of the state the widow and orphan. It appointed in each of the quarters of the city an armed militia, whom the tolling of the bell of the capitol, at any hour, was to assemble, for the general protection. It ordained that in each harbour of the coast, a vessel should be stationed for the safeguard of commerce. It decreed the sum of 100 florins to the heirs of every man who died in the defence of Rome; and it devoted the public revenues to the service and protection of the state.’ vol. i., pp. 279—281. It is remarkable, as Mr. Bulwer observes, that neither Gibbon nor Sismondi appears to have consulted the original documents preserved by Hoesemius; since, to say the least, the *representative parliament*, which it was amongst Rienzi’s first public acts to establish, is not *distinctly* mentioned by these able historians.

The prime mover in the revolution, who might have assumed any title he pleased, was contented with that of Tribune. Old Stephen Colonna hurried back to his palace with the presumption so common to his order. The madman, whom he had in former times condescended to patronize, might be destroyed he thought at any time; when the first alarm given from the great bell of the Capitol convinced him of his error. In flight lay his only safety; and, if he paused a moment in the suburb of St. Lorenzo, on his way to Palestrina, it was, as Gibbon observes, to lament his rashness and imprudence, ‘which had not trampled out *the spark* of this mighty conflagration.’ But as knowledge is power, so is ignorance weakness; and the barons were but eating the fruits of their own ways, and feeling the recoil of their own devices. The new Executive set itself to an immediate reform of the revenues. The impost called hearth-money, the salt duty, and the customs, had till that day averaged no more per annum than three hundred thousand florins. Within five months the salt-gabelle alone equalled that amount, being actually trebled in its net returns. The two following extracts, from the author of the *Decline and Fall*, are partially quoted by Mr. Bulwer; and it is, perhaps, hard to say whether the severe testimony of history is not quite as flattering to his hero’s fame as the beau ideal of the novelist’s imagination. ‘After thus restoring the forces and finances of the republic, the Tribune recalled the nobles from their solitary independence; required their personal appearance in the Capitol; and imposed an oath of allegiance to the new government, and of submission to the laws of the good estate. Apprehensive for their safety, but still more apprehensive of the danger of a refusal, the princes and barons returned to their houses at Rome, in the garb of simple and peaceful citizens: the Colonna and Orsini, the Savelli and Frangipani, were confounded before the tribunal of a plebeian, of the vile buffoon, whom they had so

‘ often derided; and their disgrace was aggravated by the indignation which they vainly struggled to disguise. The same oath was successively pronounced by the several orders of society, the clergy and gentlemen, the judges and notaries, the merchants and artizans; and the gradual descent was marked by the increase of sincerity and zeal. They swore to live and die with the republic and the church, whose interest was artfully united by the nominal association of the Bishop of Orvietto, the pope’s vicar, to the office of tribune.’

‘ Never, perhaps, has the energy and effect of a single mind been more remarkably felt than in the sudden, though transient reformation of Rome by the tribune Rienzi. A den of robbers was converted to the discipline of a camp or convent; patient to hear, swift to redress, inexorable to punish, his tribunal was always accessible to the poor and stranger; nor could birth, or dignity, or the immunities of the church protect the offender or his accomplices. The privileged houses, the private sanctuaries in Rome, on which no officer of justice would presume to trespass, were abolished, and he applied the timber and iron of their barricades in the fortifications of the Capitol. The venerable father of the Colonna was exposed in his own palace to the double shame of being desirous, and of being unable to protect a criminal. A mule, with a jar of oil, had been stolen near Capranica; and the lord of the Orsini family was condemned to restore the damage, and to discharge a fine of four hundred florins for his negligence in guarding the highways. Nor were the persons of the barons more inviolate than their lands or houses; and, either from accident or design, the same impartial rigour was exercised against the heads of the adverse factions. Peter Agapet Colonna, who had himself been senator of Rome, was arrested in the street for injury or debt; and justice was appeased by the tardy execution of Martin Orsini, who, among his various acts of violence and rapine, had pillaged a shipwrecked vessel at the mouth of the Tiber. His name, the purple of two cardinals, his uncles, a recent marriage, and a mortal disease, were disregarded by the inflexible tribune, who had chosen his victim. The public officers dragged him from his palace and nuptial bed: his trial was short and satisfactory: the bell of the Capitol convened the people: stripped of his mantle, on his knees, with his hands bound behind his back, he heard the sentence of death; and, after a brief confession, Orsini was led away to the gallows. After such an example, none could hope for impunity, and the flight of the wicked, the licentious, and the idle, soon purified the city and territory of Rome. In this time (says Fortifiocca) the woods began to rejoice, that they were no longer infested with robbers; the oxen began to plough; the pilgrims visited the sanctuaries; the



‘roads and inns were replenished with travellers; trade, plenty, and good faith were restored in the markets; and a purse of gold might be exposed without danger in the midst of the highway. As soon as the life and property of the subject are secure, the labours and rewards of industry spontaneously revive. Rome was still the metropolis of the Christian world; and the fame and fortunes of the Tribune were diffused in every country by the strangers who had enjoyed the blessings of his government.’—Gibbon, ch. LXX.

It has been objected to Rienzi by those who love him not, that the grandeur of his household equipages, and public processions, as much derogated from the real greatness of his character, as they were opposed to the simplicity in dress and attendance of the ancient Tribunes. Such persons, however, forget that the revival of liberty in the fourteenth century, through necessity, reflected the gaudy colours and manners of the day. As general habits and opinions then were, had the reformer perambulated the streets with a single beadle, and in an ordinary costume, he would presently have swung upon some convenient gibbet, amidst the contempt, if not the approbation, of all Rome. The seven hills and Campus Martius were no longer peopled by a race capable of appreciating, much less of admiring, a governor who could sleep upon straw or sup upon lentils. For bread and straws they had bartered their liberties thirteen hundred and fifty years before, and the resuscitation of literature was not enough advanced to warm and mould its age into an intellectual manhood. The liberator, therefore, worked with such wretched materials as he had; not with such as he could merely wish for. This is evident from his correspondence and other documents. He was compelled to show his new subjects that their idle splendour would not fall with the overthrow of their tyrants. He therefore covered his humble origin with sounding designations, such as ‘Nicholas the Severe and Merciful; Deliverer of Rome; Defender of Italy; Friend of mankind, and of liberty, peace, and justice; Tribune august!’ However preposterous such bombast may now appear, it was the inflation of the times, and manifests the authenticity of the narrative. His official insignia appealed both to the senses and superstition of the populace. His sceptre of polished steel enclosed a splinter of the true cross of Christ. His velvet or satin robes, lined with fur, and embroidered with gold, presented many mystical characteristics allusive to religion. Here was the jugglery of his statecraft—which, alas! has so long survived him. The horse on which he rode was white as milk; the trumpets and cymbals of his band were silver; the sun and stars, the dove and olive-branch, all shone in the great gonfalon of the Republic arching over his head; while the knighthood of the Holy Ghost, which he was to receive in the Lateran, would

have given no shock to his popularity and influence, had not a single false step demonstrated that the fabric he exulted in rearing was in reality unsubstantial as a vision, and ready to vanish into air.

Whoever has been at Rome will remember the Baptistry of Constantine, as well as the foolish legend attached to its porphyry vase. In this consecrated bath Rienzi resolved to undergo the usual knightly purification; but in so doing, if he hoped to reconcile his vanity with prudence, he altogether missed the mark. He had thus put forth his hand against the ark of the prejudices of his period; and its priests cursed him. He might have violated a virgin, or impaled a man, with far greater chance of impunity. The pope, princes, and people were alike scandalized. It was but a step from the sublime to the ridiculous to connect the anger of heaven against sacrilege with the bad management of his master of the ceremonies. When the Tribune threw himself for the night upon his bed, its framework broke down under him:

*Ex illo fluera ac retro sublapsa referri  
Spes Danaum, fractæ vives, aversa Deæ meus.*

As a finale to the farce, when he showed himself in the morning, at the hour of worship, to the returning crowds, in a purple mantle and gilded spurs, the congregation found themselves eye and ear witnesses to a scene which could alone have been exhibited at Rome, and even there conceived by none but Rienzi. At the earliest pause in the service he rose from his throne, and, in the name of the Roman people, asserted their majesty and supremacy, by summoning the pope to abandon Avignon, and reside in his diocese; and by calling upon Charles and Louis, candidates for the imperial diadem, together with all the German electors, to submit themselves and their pretensions to the rightful masters of the world. In vain his episcopal coadjutor would fain have repressed his voice and gesture. Each and every admonitory remonstrance was drowned in martial music. The throngs of those who heard, and of those who saw, felt nothing disagreeable to themselves, in a ceremonial they were far from understanding. The Bishop of Orvieto could not help dining publicly with his fellow-tribune and their joyous admirers. Even the profanation of Constantine's bath must have been forgotten in the streams of wine which flowed from the nostrils of a brazen horse dedicated to that emperor's memory. Nor was the subsequent coronation of Rienzi less imposing; presenting, as it did, a similar admixture of absurdities, both spiritual and secular, as well as associations both human and divine.

Mr. Bulwer, with the tact of an experienced story-teller, has connected the vigil of his hero in the Lateran with a conspiracy

of the barons, and an attempt at assassination. The accident of the bed breaking down induces Rienzi to reverse his position in it; so that the blow of Rudolf the murderer struck at no vital part. The tribune darted upon his assailant, disarmed him in a moment; secured him for the rest of the night; and the next day, as the price of his life, extracted from him the names of his noble employers. Five members of the Orsini, and three of the Colonna family, being clearly implicated, were arrested at a banquet given by their intended victim, and sentenced to the scaffold. The nest of serpents might thus have been crushed at once; but here occurred the true source of misfortune to Rienzi and Rome. The moral courage of the former quailed at shedding so much patrician blood; although neither the forms nor spirit of justice had been violated at the trial. Would his patriotism have been found wanting had the criminals been plebeians? And if not—why not? ‘Hath not God made of one flesh all men that dwell upon the face of the whole earth?’ But the reformer flinched in an evil hour from his allegiance to this mighty though simple truth; and it was then that the spell of aristocratic fascinations withered his right arm! He was no longer the Samson of his era; but a mortal like other men. He terrified, insulted, and finally spared foes, whom no benefits could bind, nor any thing but revenge appease. All this is plain matter of history. Their lives were forfeited not to the lawgiver, but to the law; they were pardoned because, forsooth, they were magnates. They, however, swore fresh allegiance to their benefactor; received absolution from himself and the church, with bended necks and bursting hearts; accepted anew such honours as their enfranchised country could bestow, and remained traitors more deeply dyed than before. After a few weeks, withdrawing from the city, they assembled their vassals at Marino in open rebellion. And here neither Gibbon nor his copyists have rendered common justice to their subject. Rienzi proved himself as valiant in the field, as energetic in the cabinet. An untried multitude might retreat without laurels from an attack upon an immense baronial fortress, defended by the chivalry of Italy, and yet know how to deal with their enemies. Those enemies, to the number of four thousand infantry and sixteen hundred horse, attempted in their turn to besiege the metropolis. The walls seemed carelessly guarded, and the open gates almost invited their entrance:

‘Did I not tell ye, lords,’ said the Colonna, turning round triumphantly, ‘that we should win Rome without a single blow? Grandson, where are now thy silly forebodings?’ This was said to Pietro, one of his grandsons, the first-born of Gianni, a comely youth not two weeks wedded, who made no reply. ‘My little Pietro here,’ continued the baron, speaking to his comrades, ‘is so new a bride-



groom, that last night he dreamt of his bride, and deems it, poor lad, a portent :—'

'She was in deep mourning, and glided from my arms, uttering 'Woe—woe to the Colonna!' said the young man solemnly.' Vol. II., pp. 231.

Pell-mell the proud barons entered—to bite the dust in death. Bands in ambush rushed upon them. Rienzi's battle-axe was felt as fearfully as his tongue had ever been. Crowds of the despised Romans drenched their soil in blood. Six of the Colonnas fell to rise no more, including the young bridegroom and his father. Their conqueror openly declared that 'he had cut 'off an ear, which neither pope nor emperor had been able to 'amputate.' But it is added that 'his implacable revenge denied 'the honours of burial; and the bodies of the Colonna, which he 'threatened to expose with those of the vilest malefactors, were 'secretly interred by the holy virgins of their name and family. 'The people sympathised in their grief, repented of their own 'fury, and detested the indecent joy of Rienzi, who visited the 'spot where these illustrious victims had fallen. It was on that 'fatal spot that he conferred on his son the honour of knight-hood: and the ceremony was accomplished by a slight blow 'from each of the horsemen of the guard, and by a ridiculous 'and inhuman ablution from a pool of water, which was yet polluted with patrician gore. A short delay would have saved the 'Colonna; the delay of a single month, which elapsed between 'the triumph and exile of Rienzi.' Gibbon, lxx.

The war had made a new tax necessary, and had moreover much augmented the number of widows and orphans at Rome. Private calamity, therefore, exasperated public discontent; so that a strong opposition was formed against the measures of the Tribune in his representative chamber. His government had already been compelled to appeal to force; and to maintain his ground at all it was necessary to carry matters through with a high hand. But, in the midst of all this, an excommunication had been obtained from Avignon; fulminated on the grounds of sacrilege, heresy, and rebellion. After fruitless interviews with the cardinal who brought it, the bull was solemnly issued, and turned the hearts of the bravest into stone. Rienzi soon discovered that he must lay down his power and withdraw, which he accordingly did, after the people had been once more summoned, as a last resource.

'On the face of the general multitude there was a common expression of irresolution and shame; many wept and groaned; none accused, none upbraided; but none seemed disposed to arm. It was one of those listless panics, those strange fits of indifference and lethargy which often seize upon a people, who make liberty a matter of

impulse or caprice, to whom it has become a catch-word, who have not long enjoyed all its rational, and sound, and practical, and blessed results ; who have been affrayed by the storms that herald its dawn ; a people such as is common to the south ; such as even the north has known ; such as, had Cromwell lived a year longer, even England might have seen ; and indeed, in some measure, such a *reaction* from popular enthusiasm to popular indifference as England *did* see ; when her children madly surrendered the fruits of a bloody civil war, without reserve, without foresight, to the lewd pensioner of Louis, and the royal murderer of Sydney. To such prostration of soul, such blindness of intellect, even the noblest people will be subjected, when Liberty, which should be the growth of ages, spreading its roots through the strata of a thousand customs, is raised, the exotic of an hour, and (like the Tree and Dryad of ancient fable) flourishes and withers with the single spirit that protects it.' Vol. II., pp. 273, 274.

In this way, and by such means, the city fell back into the arms of the church, and her ruthless servants, the barons. The latter, employing Count Pepin, of Minorbino, as their agent, quickly made all resistance hopeless, and seemed only resolved to recompense themselves for their lost time and recent humiliations. Rapine and violence again roamed abroad without fear or control : until aristocratic oppression becoming once more intolerable, fresh tumults ensued. The people, irritated to madness, even preferred the anarchy of two demagogues, Cerroni and Baroncelli, who passed across the dreadful scene, as the Danton and Robespierre of the Roman revolution. Rienzi, meanwhile, had escaped with his life, and realized all the incidents of romance, through the seven years which elapsed before his public return. During that interval he assumed the disguise of a hermit, a palmer, or an envoy, as circumstances required. He wandered over Italy, Germany, and Bohemia. He mingled with the pilgrims, who thronged to the shrine of the apostles at the jubilee ; and there beheld with his own eyes, far more accurately than he could ever before have done, how hopeless must be the task of making bricks without straw, of reforming rottenness, of galvanising a lifeless corpse. Yet in the depths of his indignation, Hope seems never to have quitted him. But it was becoming less and less substantial ; until, like an iris over a waterfall, it remained the vision of his passion and fanaticism. Strange and various grew the workings of his mind. When the emperor Charles the Fourth had surrendered him to the pope, the liberator of Italy without reproach or complaint, removed from Prague to Avignon, in honourable custody. Notwithstanding the bold remonstrance of Petrarch, nothing less than the horrors of a prison awaited him. The years he passed there were beguiled by the perusal of his favourite Livy, and the study of the Scriptures. Yet the iron entered into his soul, and he contracted a painful disease from his

incarceration. The following is a picture, as affecting and faithful both to truth and nature, as Sterne's captive :

'The night slowly advanced, and in the highest chamber of that dark and rugged tower, which fronted the window of the Cæsarini's palace, sate a solitary prisoner. A single lamp burnt before him on a table of stone, and threw its rays over an open Bible, and those stern but fantastic legends of ancient Rome which the genius of Livy has dignified into history. A chain hung pendant from the vault of the tower, and confined the captive ; but so as to leave his limbs at sufficient liberty to measure at will the greater part of the cell. Green and damp were the mighty stones of the walls, and through a narrow aperture, high out of reach, came the moonlight, and swept in long shadow over the rude floor. A bed at one corner completed the furniture of the room. Such for months had been the abode of the conqueror of the haughtiest barons, and the luxurious dictator of the stateliest city of the world.

'Care, and travel, and time, and adversity, had wrought their change in the person of Rienzi. The proportions of his frame had enlarged from the compact strength of earlier manhood ; the clear paleness of his cheek was bespread with a hectic of deceitful glow. Even in his present studies, intent as they seemed, and genial though the lecture to a mind enthusiastic even to fanaticism, his eyes could not rivet themselves, as of yore, steadily to the page. The charm was gone from the letters. Every now and then he moved restlessly, startled, resettled himself, and muttered broken exclamations, like a man in an anxious dream. Anon, his gaze impatiently turned upward, about, and around, and there was a strange and wandering fire in those large deep eyes, which might have thrilled the beholder with a vague and unaccountable awe.

'Aye, 'muttered the prisoner, 'these texts are comforting—comforting. The righteous shall not be always oppressed.' With a long sigh he deliberately put aside the Bible, kissed it with great reverence, remained silent and musing for some minutes, and then, as a slight noise was heard at one corner of the cell, said, softly, 'Ah ! my friends, my comrades, the rats ! it is their hours—I am glad I put aside the bread for them !' His eye brightened, as it now detected those strange and unsocial animals venturing forth through a hole in the wall, and darkening the moonshine on the floor, steal fearlessly towards him. He flung some fragments of bread to them, and for some moments watched their gambols with a smile. Manchino, the white-faced rascal ! he beats all the rest—ha ! ha ! he is a superior wretch—he commands the tribe, and will venture first into the trap. How will he bite against the steel, the fine fellow ! while all the ignobler herd will gaze at him afar off, and quake and fear, and never help. Yet, if united, they might gnaw the trap, and release their leader. Ah ! ye are base vermin, and, while ye eat my bread, if death come upon me, and I were clay, ye would riot on my carcase. Away !' and clapping his hands, the chain round him clanked harshly, and the noisome comrades of his dungeon vanished in an instant.



‘That singular and eccentric humour which marked Rienzi, and which had seemed a buffoonery to the stolid sullenness of the Roman nobles, still retained its old expression in his countenance, and he laughed loud as he saw the vermin hurry back to their hiding-place—

‘A little noise, and the clank of a chain—fie, how ye imitate mankind!’ Again he sank into silence, and then heavily and listlessly drawing towards him the animated tales of Livy, said, ‘An hour to midnight!—waking dreams are better than sleep—well, history tells us how men have risen—aye, and nations too, after wider falls than that of Rienzi or Rome.’ Vol. III., pp. 51—56.

Pope Clement was succeeded by Innocent the Sixth, whose minister, the famous Giles Albornoz, had the task committed to him of pacifying the patrimony of St. Peter. Baroncelli was tribune of the Roman populace at this juncture; and contending nobles had shared among themselves all the territories and revenues without the walls. Albornoz conceived that Rienzi, if released, might accompany him with good effect; to be played off against Baroncelli, who, destitute of talents, had nevertheless a tiger’s taste for human blood. Rienzi, therefore, was brought to a mock trial, and acquitted by a commission of four cardinals. Innocent absolved him from every charge of heresy and sedition, nominated him senator of the eternal city, and despatched him, under the auspices of his minister, to reconquer and reform it. The cardinal legate, however, was what history calls ‘a consummate statesman;’ that is, he was an incarnation of selfishness and pride; at once in his own person Archbishop of Toledo, the prime minister of an amiable but weak-minded pontiff, the descendant of the kings of Arragon, and the leader of an army. Before he could commence operations at Rome, the people had risen against Baroncelli, and destroyed him. Albornoz then regretted that he had allowed any one to share with him in an enterprise to which he now felt equal without any assistance from the popular senator. He allowed the latter neither money, nor troops, nor countenance. But Rienzi outwitted him, and made a public entrance amidst rejoicings, which must have revived the memory of former times. Once more his persuasive and kindling eloquence restored the Buono Stato to the mortification of both the barons and hierarchy. His second administration, much shorter than the first, is said to have avoided its errors. But every thing was against him—prejudice, bigotry, pride, disappointed avarice, universal malversation, suspicion, and popular indifference. There was no substratum of principle on which to re-lay the foundations of freedom; and the necessity, which he must always have foreseen, of imposing a fresh impost was the signal for his final downfall. In vain had order been partially restored, with something like a prospect of that restoration being

perfected. In vain had he secured, tried, and decapitated the captain of the Grand Company, Walter de Montreal, over whom the grave would have closed in shame, as over any other robber, had it not been for his riches, and the age of chivalry. The Romans betrayed their own interests, as well as their truest friend. The barons scattered everywhere fuel for sedition to feed upon; whilst Albornozy at least kept back the means of its extinction. Brief was the delay in those times between resolution and action. Early in the morning of the 8th Sept. A. D. 1354, before light, a furious mob invested the Capitol:

‘The soldiers of the barons had already mixed themselves with the throng—more deadly weapons than stones aided the wrath of the multitude—darts and arrows darkened the air; and now a voice was heard, shrieking, ‘Way for the torches!’ Red in the sunlight, they tossed and waved, and danced to and fro above the heads of the crowd, as if the fiends were let loose among the mob. Straw, and wood, and litter were piled hastily round the great doors of the Capitol, and the smoke suddenly curled up, beating back the rush of the assailants.’ Vol. III., pp. 336, 337.

The senator was basely deserted by his guards, and even the officers of his household. He let himself down by a sheet into the balcony, from whence he had so often harangued his fellow-citizens, and who, even then, as an anonymous, though contemporary, author asserts, would have recoiled from their murderous purposes, could he but have once obtained a hearing. Such was, and is, and ever must be, the superiority of mind and virtue over brute force and turbulence. Catching up a banner of the republic, he waved it, gesticulated, commanded, entreated, and was answered by a dreadful volley of imprecations and missiles. One of the last wounded his hand; upon which he withdrew into his inner apartment. But onward went the work of destruction, and he made an effort to save his life by escaping in disguise. He was discovered in the act, dragged to the platform before the palace, and, after another tremendous interval, in which some cried one thing and some another, a dagger was plunged into his bosom. Wounds and insults were meanly multiplied upon his dead body: and the only monument his friends could hope for must have been the admiration of mankind.

That admiration, it is believed, can never be in fairness withheld. An occasional transgression of the rules of temperance is the solitary vice attributed by his enemies to one who had sufficiently earned their hatred. We have purposely abstained from bringing forward that portion of our author’s pages devoted to the romance rather than the real history of Rienzi. This portion is not large; and, while altogether distinct from the rest, is so skillfully handled, as to shed lustre upon the entire narrative. The

female characters, such as Nina the wife, and Irene the sister of the Tribune, move and make music, like the Syrens of the scene; and afford suitable opportunities for the introduction of many striking incidents, several most beautiful descriptions of scenery, and various portraitures of Italian manners. Perhaps Adeline, the fair mistress of Walter de Montreal, may become the reader's favourite. Her character, fortunes, and peculiar loveliness are just those creations of the fancy which interweave themselves with the affections of the heart. The men of her day were wild warriors, iron-minded oppressors, stern enthusiasts, or fettered slaves. But there were evidently a few such women as herself; injured but not corrupted; in life adored, and in death bewailed. The glory of our own age is, that virtue and happiness are becoming the features of immense social masses, instead of shining here and there, as insulated, though brilliant individualities. One reason, amongst others, for this is, that the regimen of the many is superseding that of the few: as the middle classes are growing up around the palaces of sovereigns and aristocracies, throughout the fairest realms of Europe. Governments, however modified, must have the public welfare for their basis; they can only last by identifying themselves with the laws of eternal justice, and they must offer equal protection to all, without partiality and without hypocrisy.

---

Art. V. *A Collection of English Sonnets*. By R. F. HOUSMAN.  
London: 1836.

THE want of encouragement to attempt any great achievement in poetry, recently experienced, has been attended by such results as were to be expected. Those who have sought to cultivate an acquaintance with the muses, have almost entirely confined themselves to the production of short pieces on Miscellaneous subjects. And among the various forms which have been employed for the expression of the writer's sentiments, that of the Sonnet has become the greatest favourite. The Sonnet, indeed, has of late years had so prominent a place assigned it in our English poetical literature, that we propose to make some detailed observations regarding it.

The origin of the Sonnet is uncertain. Some suppose it was invented by the Sicilians: others ascribe it to the Provenceaux. With which of these people, or whether with either of them, the Sonnet originated, is now a matter which must for ever remain in obscurity. With regard to the soil in which it was first most successfully cultivated, no uncertainty exists. That soil was Italy; and there it still flourishes in its greatest freshness and beauty. In Spain and Portugal it has been cultivated with considerable success. In France, as in England, it has never been



a favourite among poets of the highest order. It is true that some of the greatest poetic geniuses of France have written a variety of Sonnets, but they have in almost every instance ceased to attract attention. Whether this has been from the author's failing in this species of composition, or from the strong prejudice which exists in that country against the Sonnet, is a point which it is not in our power to determine. The probability is, that the effect may be traced to the conjoint operation of both causes.

The Sonnet has not only hitherto been more popular in Italy than in any other part of Europe, but there can be no question it will continue to be cultivated with greater success in that country than any where else. There is something particularly adapted to its peculiar structure in the language of Italy. That language possesses a smoothness and harmony to which no other European language approaches. The Spanish and the Portuguese are, in this respect, nearest the Italian,—which, by the way, is probably one of the principal reasons why the Sonnet has been more successfully cultivated in those countries, next to Italy, than in any other part of the world. In Italy the production of a good Sonnet will of itself insure immortality to the writer; while longer poems fall still-born from the press. To procure immortality by inditing fourteen lines, is surely procuring it on easy enough terms. In this country, on the other hand, there is perhaps no instance on record in which a writer has obtained any thing deserving the name of even a temporary celebrity by penning Sonnets, however great may have been their number. Shakspeare, Milton, Gray, Wordsworth, and many others of our most popular poets, have all written Sonnets; but if they had never written any thing else, their names would never have been heard of. To be a Sonneteer, if a man be nothing else, is, in the estimation of many, to be something to which there attaches a sort of literary disrepute. Dr. Johnson defines a Sonneteer to be 'a small contemptible poet.' In the lexicographer's days Sonnets certainly covered their authors with a species of obloquy in the notions of literary men. Since then they have acquired a more respectable standing in our literature; and have become much more numerous.

We will afterwards express our views as to the place which the Sonnet ought to occupy in English literature. In the meantime, let us glance at the peculiar characteristics of this species of poetic composition. As before mentioned, it is limited to fourteen lines, and is divided into four parts. These parts are subdivided into two quatrains and two tercets. Where the rules which govern the structure of the Sonnet are strictly observed, the subject will be set forth in the first quatrain, illustrated in the second; confirmed by the first tercet, and concluded in the second. The great excellence of the Sonnet depends on the way in which it is

finished. If it closes with a feeble or abrupt expression, it will be a failure, however terse and felicitous the diction in the previous parts. Hence it is, that some writer on the subject whose name we do not at this moment recollect, lays it down as essential to the success of the Sonnet, that it should close with a golden key. These rules, however, are not usually observed by our modern writers of Sonnets,—which is doubtless, one reason why this species of poetical composition has been generally regarded with so little respect. Even most of our distinguished poets, who have occasionally betaken themselves to the penning of Sonnets, have deviated more or less from those necessary rules. Gray, indeed, is the only English poet of note who has scrupulously observed them. In Italy they are most rigidly adhered to. Any Sonnet writer of celebrity in that country, would as soon think of finishing his Sonnet in twelve lines, or extending it to sixteen, as he would think of violating any of the rules to which we have referred. In this country, where one dashes off a Sonnet at a heat, no conception can be formed of the labour which is expended in Italy on the production of a good Sonnet. Petrarch, the most ancient, as well as most celebrated of the Sonnet writers of Italy, used to bestow months on the production of a single Sonnet. Bembo, a more recent Italian poet, is said to have had a desk, with forty divisions, through which his Sonnets passed in succession before they were published; and in their transition through each, they received some new touch from his pen. One would wonder at this immense expenditure of labour on fourteen lines of poetical composition, did we not recollect the fact already mentioned, that the production of a single good Sonnet insures the immortality of the author.

It was from Italy that the Sonnet was transplanted to England. The first Sonnet of any note was written upwards of three centuries ago, by Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey. As it is one of the earliest of our English Sonnets, we here transcribe it. It is headed, 'Night.'

Alas!—so all things now do hold their peace!

Heaven and earth disturbed in no thing:

The beasts, the air, the birds their song do cease,

The nightèd chair the stars about doth bring.

Calm is the sea; the waves work less and less;

So am not I, whom Love, alas, doth wring,

Bringing before my face the great increase

Of my desires, whereat I weep and sing.

In joy and woe, as in a doubtful ease;

For my sweet thoughts sometime do pleasure bring;

But, by and by, the cause of my disease

Gives me a pang that inwardly doth sting,

When that I think what grief it is again.

To live and lack the thing should rid my pain.

Philip indited a variety of Sonnets. Some of them possess considerable merit. The one on 'Sleep,' appears to us to be among the best:—

'Come, Sleep! O Sleep! the certain knot of peace,  
 The bating-place of wit, the balm of woe,  
 The poor man's wealth, the prisoner's release,  
 Th' indifferent judge between the high and low;  
 With shield of proof shield me from out the prease\*  
 Of those fierce darts despair at me doth throw;  
 O, make in me those civil wars to cease;  
 I will good tribute pay, if thou do so.  
 Take thou of me sweet pillows, sweetest bed;  
 A chamber deaf to noise, and blind to light;  
 A rosy garland, and a weary head.  
 And if these things, as being thine by right,  
 Move not thy heavy grace, thou shalt in me,  
 Livelier than elsewhere, Stella's image see.'

Mr. Housman only presents us with one of Sir Walter Raleigh's Sonnets. It is 'On Spenser's Fairy Queen.'

'Methought I saw the grave where Laura lay,  
 Within that temple where the vestal flame  
 Was wont to burn; and, passing by that way,  
 To see that buried dust of living fame,  
 Whose tomb fair Love and fairer Virtue kept,  
 All suddenly I saw the Fairy Queen;  
 At whose approach the soul of Petrarch wept,  
 And from thenceforth those Graces were not seen:  
 For they this Queen attended—in whose stead  
 Oblivion laid him down on Laura's hearse;  
 Hereat, the hardest stones were seen to bleed,  
 And groans of buried ghosts the heavens did pierce,  
 When Homer's sprite did tremble all for grief,  
 And curs'd th' access of that celestial thief.'

Passing over some Sonnets by Daniel and Michael Drayton, we come to the Bard of Avon. Mr. Housman gives twenty-six of Shakspeare's Sonnets. We can only make room for the following, on 'Beauty.'

'O! how much more doth Beauty beauteous seem,  
 By that sweet ornament which Truth doth give!  
 The Rose looks fair, but fairer we it deem  
 For that sweet odour which doth in it live.'



The cankerblooms have full as deep a dye  
 As the perfum'd tincture of the roses,  
 Hang on such thorns, and play as wantonly,  
 When Summer's breath their mask'd buds discloses.  
 But, (for their virtue only is their show)  
 They live unwoo'd, and unrespected fade ;  
 Die to themselves. Sweet roses do not so:  
 Of their sweet deaths are sweetest odours made ;  
 And so of you, beauteous and lovely youth,  
 When that shall fade, my verse distils your truth.'

We pass over several unknown names and come to William Drummond, of Hawthornden, who, in our opinion, was one of the best writers of Sonnets which either England, or Scotland, or Ireland has produced. Mr. Housman gives seventeen Sonnets from Drummond. We have only space for one. It is headed, 'No Trust in Time,' and is as worthy of praise for its sound divinity as for its poetic merits:

'Look how the flower which lingeringly doth fade,  
 The morning's darling late, the summer's queen,  
 Spoiled of that juice which kept it fresh and green,  
 As high as it did raise, bows low the head ;  
 Just so, the pleasures of my life being dead,  
 Or in their contraries but only seen,  
 With swifter speed declines than erst it spread,  
 And, blasted, scarce now shows what it hath been.  
 Therefore, as doth the pilgrim, whom the night  
 Hastes darkly to imprison on his way,  
 Think on thy home, my soul, and think aright  
 Of what's yet left thee of life's wasting day ;  
 Thy sun posts westward—pass'd is thy morn—  
 And twice it is not given thee to be born.'

This brings us to Milton, of whose Sonnets Mr. Housman presents us with sixteen. We give the one on his own blindness:

'When I consider how my light is spent  
 Ere half my days, in this dark world and wide,  
 And that one talent which is death to hide,  
 Lodg'd with me useless, though my soul more bent  
 To serve therewith my Maker, and present  
 My true account, lest he, returning, chide ;  
 Doth God exact day-labour, light denied ?  
 I fondly ask—but Patience, to prevent  
 That murmur, soon replies—God doth not need  
 Either man's work or his own gifts ; who best  
 Bear his mild yoke, they serve him best ; his state  
 Is kingly ; thousands at his bidding speed,  
 And post o'er land and ocean without rest ;  
 They also serve who only stand and wait.'

Thomas Warton and William Mason come next, but we must pass them by to give the following from the Bard of Olney. It is headed, 'To Mrs. Unwin.'

' Mary!—I want a lyre with other strings ;  
 Such aid from heaven as some have feigned they drew ;  
 An eloquence scarce given to mortals, new  
 And undebased by praise of meaner things ;  
 That 'ere, through age or woe, I shed my wings,  
 I may record thy worth with honour due,  
 In verse as musical as thou art true,  
 And that immortalizes whom it sings.  
 But thou hast little need. There is a book  
 By seraphs writ with beams of heavenly light,  
 On which the eyes of God not rarely look ;  
 A chronicle of actions just and bright.  
 There all thy deeds, my faithful Mary, shine—  
 And since thou own'st that praise, I spare thee mine.'

The following is the only Sonnet given from Sir Egerton Brydges. It is headed, 'Echo and Silence.'

' In eddying course when leaves began to fly,  
 And Autumn in her lap the store to strew,  
 As mid wild scenes I chanced the Muse to woo,  
 Through glens untrod, and woods that frown'd on high,  
 Two sleeping Nymphs with wonder mute I spy !  
 And lo, she's gone! In robe of dark-green hue,  
 'Twas Echo from her sister Silence flew ;  
 For quick the hunter's horn resounded to the sky !  
 In shade affrighted Silence melts away ;  
 Not so her sister :—hark ! for onward still  
 With far-heard step she takes her listening way,  
 Bounding from rock to rock, and hill to hill !  
 Ah, mark the merry maid in mockful play  
 With thousand mimic tones the laughing forest fill !'

Of William Wordsworth's Sonnets Mr. Housman gives no fewer than fifty-six. We extract the one which the author wrote 'After Visiting the Field of Waterloo.'

' A winged goddess, clothed in vesture wrought  
 Of rainbow colours—one whose port was bold,  
 Whose overburdened hand could scarcely hold  
 The glittering crowns and garlands which it brought,  
 Hovered in air above the far-famed spot.  
 She vanished—leaving prospect blank and cold  
 Of wind-swept corn that wide around us rolled  
 In dreary billows—wood, and meagre cot,  
 And monuments that soon must disappear.  
 Yet a dread local recompence we found ;

While glory seemed betrayed, while patriot zeal  
Sank in our hearts, we felt as men *should* feel  
With such vast hoards of hidden carnage near,  
And horror breathing from the silent ground.'

A single specimen is given of Coleridge's powers as a Sonneteer, and three specimens of Mr. Charles Lamb's. We cannot find room for either of these; but must come at once to Lord Byron's. Mr. Housman presents us with three of his lordship's Sonnets. The following is 'To Genevra.'

'Thy cheek is pale with thought, but not from woe;  
And yet so lovely, that if mirth could flush  
Its rose of whiteness with the brightest blush,  
My heart would wish away that ruder glow.  
And dazzle not thy deep blue eyes—but oh!  
While gazing on them sterner eyes will gush,  
And into mine my mother's weakness rush,  
Soft as the last drops round heaven's airy bow.  
For through thy long dark lashes low depending,  
The soul of melancholy gentleness  
Gleams like a seraph from the sky descending,  
Above all pain, yet pitying all distress;  
At once such majesty with sweetness blending,  
I worship more, but cannot love thee less.'

Then follow Sonnets from Professor Wilson, Archdeacon Wrangham, John Keats, Thomas Pringle, Barry Cornwall, Ismael Fitzadam, Richard Howitt, and several other writers, whose names are not generally known. Among the Sonnets thus given, there are several which possess considerable merit; but we have no space for specimens. A variety of notes follow, in which some interesting information is given respecting several of the Sonnetteers from whom Mr. Housman has made extracts.

We have thus glanced at some of the Sonnets which have been written by our most distinguished English poets for the last 300 years. The admirers of poems, if so they must be called, necessarily consisting of fourteen lines, will thank Mr. Housman for the selections he has made. We think, however, that his task might have been much more efficiently performed. How happens it, that while he has given from fifteen to twenty specimens of the Sonnets of certain deceased writers, he has not given a single specimen of the Sonnets of others? Above all, how happens it, that while he is so liberal in his specimens of the Sonnets of some of our living poets, he not only does not present us with any specimens of the Sonnets of others, but does not even name the authors at all. Mr. David Lester Richardson, the gentleman who started the 'London Weekly Review,' from



the ashes of which the 'Court Journal' arose, has acquired considerable celebrity as a writer of Sonnets. Some years since he published a volume of *Miscellaneous Poems*, the greater portion of which consisted of Sonnets, and yet Mr. Housman neither gives a single specimen from him, nor even alludes to him at all. We have not Mr. Richardson's volume at hand, otherwise we would have proved, by quotations from it, that some of that gentleman's Sonnets were equal, with two or three exceptions, to any thing Mr. Housman has given from living writers. Had Mr. H. been better acquainted with the works of modern poets, he would have found scattered among them a variety of beautiful Sonnets, which he might, with great propriety, have given. In the works, for example, of Mrs. G. G. Richardson, a lady who has written a great deal of delightful poetry, on almost every variety of subject, he would have found several Sonnets well worthy of a place in his pages. Take the following, from one of her volumes published a few years since, as a specimen of her powers in this way:—

'My darling boy! light of my sinking heart!  
 Through shades of hov'ring death, still sweet to me!  
 Tho' from thy dearer father warn'd to part,  
 Death seems more cruel when I gaze on thee!  
 Yet thou, (the only one of all I love!)  
 Wilt sigh not, pause not, drop for me no tear—  
 A broken toy, a scatter'd flow'r, will move  
 In thee more sorrow than thy mother's bier!  
 Fantastic thought! and yet how strangely sad—  
 That when in Death's cold clasp, all faded lies,  
 Thy youthful mother—once in thee how glad!  
 Thou may'st as now, gaze on with laughing eyes—  
 Peering on arduous tip-toe o'er her bed—  
 Unconscious that she never more shall rise!'

But what surprises us most of all in the omissions of Mr. Housman, is the way in which he has treated Sir Egerton Brydges. To the venerable Baronet he has only assigned as much of his space as would contain a single Sonnet. Shall we ascribe this to a want of knowledge of Sir Egerton's writings, or to a want of judgment? We can hardly ascribe the neglect with which the Baronet is treated to the first cause. We cannot persuade ourselves that any literary man of the present day, could be ignorant of the fact that Sir Egerton is incomparably the most voluminous of the existing race of Sonnetteers. We had lately the manuscript of what is intended to be a third volume of Sir Egerton's *Autobiography* in our possession, and he there states that he has, from first to last, written nearly 7,000 Sonnets. A very great proportion of these have been published. They are scattered, not

only throughout all Sir Egerton's own works, but throughout the various periodicals of the day. It is difficult, therefore, to convince ourselves that Mr. Housman could be ignorant of the fact of Sir Egerton's extreme voluminousness as a writer of Sonnets. Can it be then that he is aware of the fact, but does not rank Sir Egerton so high in the scale of Sonnetteers as to deem him worthy of more than the quotation of one Sonnet, out of the thousands he has published? If so, Mr. Housman's judgment is grievously at fault. We hold Sir Egerton to be equal, if not superior, to any contemporary writer of Sonnets. Wordsworth himself says, that some of his Sonnets are equal to any thing of the kind which has appeared in the English language. Southey has expressed a similar opinion. If we had space, we should prove the soundness of their judgment by various extracts. As it is, we can only refer our readers back to the specimen, 'Echo and Silence,' which, following Mr. Housman, we have already given. We know not of a more beautiful fourteen-lined production in the whole range of our poetical literature.

Hitherto we have expressed no opinion as to the station which the Sonnet is entitled to occupy in English literature. On this point a great diversity of sentiment exists. Some persons are inclined to assign to it, if not the highest, a very high place in English poetry: others contend that it is discreditable to our literature. Both opinions are, in our apprehension, erroneous. The truth in this, as in most other cases where extreme views are adopted, will be found to lie in the centre. That the Sonnet has no pretensions to be placed in a very high, far less the highest class of English poetry, may be inferred from the fact, that no man has ever yet attained to any great reputation merely by writing Sonnets. It affords no scope for first-rate talent. Its narrow limits, to say nothing of its peculiar structure, will admit of no great display of genius. The introduction of incident is out of the question. All that the Sonnet writer can aspire to, is the working out of a single idea. And even that idea must be one not much beyond the level of common place. Any very great or striking idea can never be done justice to in the limited space of fourteen lines, more especially as the writer must feel himself hampered with the necessary quatrains and tercets, not to mention the difficulty of finding words to rhyme. Is our position doubted? Then let us refer those who may be sceptical on the point, to the exhibitions which our greatest poets have made in their character as Sonnetteers. We have given a specimen of the Sonnets of Shakspeare, Milton, and Byron. And perhaps the Sonnets we have given from these distinguished men are the best they ever wrote. Do they sustain their character as poets in their fourteen line productions? Assuredly not. Their Sonnets are as much more inferior to their other works as were

the writings of their contemporaries to those productions of theirs which will transmit their names to the latest posterity. What do we find in the Sonnets of Shakspeare? Nothing that might not be reasonably looked for in any of those which are penned by the fourth and fifth rate poets of the present day. There is an utter absence of that brilliancy of thought, and singular freedom and felicity of expression, which pervade all his tragedies and comedies. Then, as to Milton, again,—in vain do we look in his Sonnets for the remotest approach to that sublimity of conception, and energy of language, which so strikingly characterize his 'Paradise Lost,' from the first page to the last. With regard to Byron, the contrast which he exhibits to himself, considered as a Sonneteer and as the author of 'Childe Harold,' or of any other of his great poems, is no less striking. No sooner does he set himself down to the inditing of the fourteen lines, than the fire of his genius is utterly extinguished. His bold and impetuous spirit is at once tamed down; he is no longer the same man. We might extend the illustration further; but it is unnecessary. It must, we think, be sufficiently manifest that no poetic genius of the first class ought to have any thing to do with Sonnet writing. It is beyond the limits of possibility, that he can make such an achievement in that way as can add to his fame; he is sure to injure his reputation by the attempt, if he do not make himself absolutely ridiculous. A man possessing the true poetic spirit cannot sit down to indite a Sonnet without feeling himself, as it were, moving in fetters. All is stiff and artificial; the only surprise is, that such men as Shakspeare, and Milton, and Byron, could ever have stooped to such writing. They could only have done it in those moments—moments which, we believe, all great geniuses occasionally have—when the mind, from exhaustion, or some other cause, was suffering under a temporary debility.

There are persons who run to the other extreme, and represent Sonnet writing as altogether contemptible, and the Sonnet itself as unworthy a place in English literature. This is as great an error as the other. For certain purposes we regard the Sonnet as exceedingly well adapted. Nothing could be more so for the working out of a single happy, though not strikingly original idea. There are many pleasing instances of this in the Sonnets both of past times and in those of the present period. The Sonnet has this advantage in such cases, that the necessary restriction to fourteen lines prevents an undue amplification of one good idea,—which amplification of ideas is the besetting sin of most of our contemporary writers of poetry. For any thing plaintive or tender, the Sonnet is singularly adapted. Hence it will be found that all our best Sonnets are of this character. We are aware that some indiscriminate admirers of the Sonnet main-



tain that it is equally adapted for humour or satire. The supposition is altogether groundless. If it were correct, how happens it that none of our English poets have ever employed it for such purposes? There is no instance on record, so far as we are aware, in which it has been so employed. Certain we are, that if an attempt were made to apply it to humour or satire, the writer would only make himself ridiculous. Its very structure forbids the making any such attempt.

But to draw to a conclusion. We should be sorry to see the Sonnet banished entirely from our literature. We have read many Sonnets with unmingled pleasure. We have many a time and oft, felt the tenderest chords in our heart reverberating to their touching tones. Still we do not like to see this species of poetical literature cultivated to the extent it is at the present time; much less do we like to see such a man as Wordsworth—one who is capable of immeasurably greater achievements—boasting in the authorship of 400 of these productions. Poetry of a higher class suffers of necessity from this. However, as we before said, we think we see every where around us indications of a recurrence to a former state of things, when Sonnet writing, which is but a species of literary trifling, was only practised to a limited extent, and when works of a higher class were written, read, and appreciated.

---

Art. VI. *A New and Copious Lexicon of the Latin Language; compiled chiefly from the Magnum Totius Latinitatis Lexicon of Facciolati and Forcellini, and the German Works of Scheller and Luenemann.* Edited by F. P. LEVERETT. London: Richard James Kennett. Boston: John H. Wilkens. 1837.

IT is certainly not one of the minor advantages of a literary nature which abound in the present day, that we are furnished with efficient lexicographical aid in prosecuting the study of the ancient languages. In addition to the contributions which have been made, from time to time, in this country towards improving our Latin dictionaries, we have, in no small measure, been beholden to continental scholars of eminence, who have consecrated their energies to this department of literature, and, in various ways, enriched its stores. To Facciolatus and Forcellinus, in particular, we are under the deepest obligations for the indefatigable diligence which their great work every where evinces, and to Mr. Bailey for his labour in translating the Italian significations, and collecting together the copious stores with which he has enriched his English edition. As a library book, it forms a splendid ornament; and as a book of reference, it will ever retain its value; but the fact, that the two quarto volumes, con-

taining upwards of 2,700 pages, are now selling at the reduced price of £2. 10s., proves, that something in a more convenient size and form was required for daily use in the tuition of youth.

The *Lexicon* announced at the head of this article admirably supplies this desideratum. The lamented editor, who died soon after its appearance, assisted in his labours by Messrs. Bradford, Pirscher, and Torrey, all of them accurate and diligent scholars, has furnished a work which will be found entitled to a distinguished place in the province of lexicography. He has not only drawn largely on the *Totius Latinitatis*, and availed himself of the best Latin-German *Lexicons*, especially those of Scheller and Luenemann, but has applied to the selection of his matter, and the arrangement of the different meanings of words, those principles of taste, and sound critical judgment, which the advanced state of learning imperiously demands. Besides giving exact definitions of words, their derivations, and relations, he is singularly happy in presenting the various phrases and idioms, in their natural places, to the view; and appears to have succeeded admirably in distinguishing the nicer shades and modifications to which the meanings of the words are subject. Considerable attention has been paid to etymology—especially that of such Latin words as have been derived from Greek roots, making all due allowance for the circumstance, that many are in both languages derived from a common stock.

One peculiarly valuable feature in this *Lexicon*, is the appropriate supply of encyclopædial matter, which we find introduced in connexion with proper names, and such words as relate to the history, antiquities, and especially the mythologies of Greece and Rome, which, entering as they so essentially do, into the whole frame-work of Latin poetry, possess indisputable claims on a place in works of such a nature.

The following specimens, selected at random, will convey to our readers a pretty accurate idea of a production, which does equal credit to American scholarship and the American press.

ÆGRĒ (æger), adverb, *unwillingly, discontentedly, with chagrin, with inconvenience*, graviter, moleste, ægro, invitove animo, δυσχερῶς. Cic. Si quis ægre ferat, se pauperem esse. Id. Nihil vidi melius: itaque careo ægre. Plaut. Ægre pati. Liv. Quod ægrius patimur. Sallust. Ægerrime ferre aliquid.—¶ Ægre esse alicui, *to be unpleasant, troublesome, to any one* Terent. Ægre est. *This grieves me; this is hard.* Id. Non te pro his curasse rebus, ne quid ægre esset mihi? *That nothing should happen to displease me, put me out, grieve me.* Plaut. Quid tibi ex filio nam, obsecro, ægre est? *What is it connected with your son that grieves you?* Id. Nescio quid meo animo ægre est. *Something troubles me, I am not at ease.*—¶ Ægre facere alicui, *to trouble, vex, displease.* Plaut.—¶ Ægre habere, *to bear it ill, to be displeased.* Plaut.—¶ Ægre often signifies, *with much ado, hardly, not easily*, χαλεπῶς. Cic. Ægre me tenui. Id. Nihil

ægrius factum est. *Sallust.* Omne bellum sumi facile; ceterum ægerrime desinere.

‘Atrāx, ācis, m. Ἀτρεῖς, a river of *Ætolia*; *Plin.*—¶ Also, a town of *Thessaly*. *Liv.*—¶ Also, one of the *Lapithæ*, father of *Cæneus* and *Hippodamia*; whence *Atracius*, a, um, *Thessalian*. *Stat.* *Atracia ars, magic.*

‘Iō (Ἰώ) us and ōnis, f. a daughter of *Inachus*, king of *Argus*, beloved by *Jupiter*. As *Juno* became jealous of his intrigues, he changed *Io* into a cow; but the goddess, who knew the fraud, obtained from her husband the animal, and set over her as a guard, the hundred-eyed *Argus*, whom, however, *Mercury*, at the command of *Jupiter*, lulled to sleep and destroyed. After many misfortunes, upon *Juno*’s being somewhat pacified, *Io* was changed again from a cow into a woman, and brought forth *Epaphus*, married *Osiris*, and became an *Egyptian* goddess, under the name of *Isis*. *Ovid.*—The *nominat.* *Ion* is also found. *Ovid.*

‘THERMÆ (θερμός, η, ον, warm), ārum, f. warm baths, warm springs, θερμὰ ὑδάτα.—Hence several towns are called *Thermæ*, on account of their warm springs; for instance, one in *Sicily*. *Plin.* Hence *Thermītānus*, an inhabitant of *Thermæ* (in *Sicily*), and *Thermītanī*, the inhabitants of, &c. *Cic.*—¶ There were also artificial structures, called *Thermæ*, in which the water was heated by furnaces. These were not merely buildings furnished with bathing-rooms, but were also splendid edifices, highly adorned and arranged for various diversions and recreations. *Plin.* and *Martial.*

‘TŌPICŪS (τοπικός), a, um, adj. relating to the sources of arguments. *Cic.* Institui topica Aristotelia conscribere, h. e. a writing in which the sources of argument, topics, common places are collected, or pointed out (the work of *Cicero*, called *Topica*, is extant). Hence, *Topice*, es, f. (for *topica*, sc. *ars*) the science of common places, the art of finding arguments. *Cic.*

‘ŪNCIĀ (unc.) æ, f. the twelfth part of an as; also, the twelfth part of any whole, as of a pound. *Plant.* Auri pondo uncia. *Plin.* *Uncia aloes*, the twelfth part of a pound, an ounce. Also of an inheritance; as *Cic.* *Cæsar ex uncia* (heres). Also, the twelfth part of a jugerum. *Colum.* Also, the twelfth part of a foot, an inch. *Frontin.* Hence, *Pandect.* *Uncias usuras*, h. e. one per cent., for one twelfth per cent. a month, amounts to one per cent. per annum, (here *Uncias* is either an *adj.*, or *usuras* is in *apposition*).—¶ Also, any trifle, a little bit, a small piece. *Plaut.* Neque piscium unciam cœpi. *Juvenal.* Nulla uncia nobis est eboris. *Martial.* Nulla de nostro nobis uncia venit apro.

To the work is appended a Catalogue of Latin Authors, who wrote before and after the time of Christ; a Table of Abbreviations; and an Account of the Reckoning of Time among the Romans. We warmly recommend it to the attention of Tutors, and Masters of Schools, as one of the most valuable helps they can put into the hands of their pupils; and to all who are desirous of acquiring a thorough knowledge of the Latin tongue.



Art. VII. *The Communion of Saints; or, the Scriptural Principles of Church Fellowship and Government, delivered to a newly-formed Church.* By JAMES BENNETT, D.D. London: Hamilton and Co. 12mo. 1837.

THE author of this work was invited to give an address to a newly-formed Congregational Church at Reading. The address appears to have produced a very deep impression on the minds of those who heard it; and the result is, that the principles laid down on that occasion having received a fuller exposition from the writer, he has published it. We heartily commend him for so doing. The publication is small; but it requires, and will have, we doubt not, an attentive perusal, and we hope also a very wide circulation. We do not know how far our readers sympathise with us, but we have an almost unconquerable repugnance to big books. A folio is alarming—a quarto barely tolerable—an octavo readable—but a duodecimo, which we can carry in our hand, or put into our pocket, is an especial favourite. We have generally found, too, when a clever writer has to discuss an important subject, in a small space, that there is so much compression of thought, so much perspicuity in expression, such an absence of redundant ornament and mere verbiage, as give peculiar life and spirit to the treatise, which in larger works are often wanting.

The Essay now under review is a most satisfactory instance of the truth of the preceding remarks. It is well written, and well argued,—manly, honest, and powerful. Principles are laid down with precision and firmness. They are supported with courage and skill. Difficulties are fairly met. Objections are treated with the utmost candour. When they cannot be removed,—and that is seldom indeed,—the fact is admitted without scruple. The argument is fully carried out, and the spirit displayed from beginning to end, is eminently upright and christian. We have rarely met with a work which contains matter of so much real value in so small a compass, nor with one which we can speak of with such undisguised and almost unqualified approbation.

It is stated, with much truth, that ‘the great principles of Christian fellowship are two; that the Scriptures are the only authoritative rule; and that Christ is the only spiritual ruler to whom the saints must bow.’ Our author maintains, that *tradition* is of no authority. He holds in light estimation what is called the testimony of the church; and shows the fallacy of the statement put forth in various quarters, ‘that we can know the Scriptures only from the church.’ To maintain that we must first know the church before we can know the Scriptures, and that we must first know the Scriptures before we can know the

church, clearly involves a contradiction. 'One of these two must be an independent witness; for to make their authority mutually dependent on each other is pure nonsense.' This is stating the question at the outset as it ought to be stated, and our readers shall see how it is handled by our author.

'But how can we examine what is called the church? Where can we find it? . . . . For what is the church? We shall shortly see that a single congregation of Christians is called by that name? Yet the testimony of one congregation cannot decide the agitated question; for there are others who have an equal right to be heard. Can we consult them all? Who knows where they all *are*, or *were*, during the first four centuries? For the earliest ecclesiastical history is exceedingly scanty and defective. . . . The records we have are not invariably derived from the purest sources, but are so tainted as to excite strong suspicions of error and corruption. Yet the men who have written are the only witnesses we can consult; though we know well, from the example of our own days, that authors are not always the holiest and best of men; for they often publish error and folly, while thoughts more worthy of our adoption lie concealed in the bosoms of those who write nothing. . . . Some of the earliest Christians became authors, because they had previously been Pagan philosophers, accustomed to dictate to mankind; and their writings prove that they had brought, from the schools of heathen philosophy, much of what they wrote, which soon corrupted the church from the simplicity which is in Christ. . . . Origen and Tertullian are two of the earliest writers—the former in Greek, the latter in Latin; and they both labour under the charge of heresy. Clement Romanus, who is thought to have been that Clement mentioned by Paul, Phil. iv. 3, wrote an Epistle to the Corinthians, which is the most precious morsel of ecclesiastical antiquity; and yet it attempts to prove the resurrection by the foolish story of the Phoenix, which is assumed to be a fact. If I were to read to you some of the heathenish things which the other Clement of Alexandria has written, though he was one of the earliest theological tutors, you would exclaim, 'Away with such trash!' . . . . If Chrysostom and Augustine have furnished us with wiser and better things, it is because they have more largely expounded the Scriptures, their guide and ours.'—pp. 4—6.

Our readers will see from this extract in what a decided and fearless manner the author maintains his position. He does not allow his mind to be warped by an undue veneration for *old things*. He does not consider antiquity an infallible argument, and he gives a most striking illustration of the truth of his representation, which we cannot refrain from noticing.

'If any wonder at what has been said, supposing that the earliest ages must have been the wisest, because the nearer the fountain the clearer the streams, let them remember, that the first converts among the south-sea Islanders, the Hottentots, and the Chinese, will, in future centuries, be venerated as the fathers of their respective

churches: but who can suppose that they who come feeling their way out of the darkness of a Pagan education must prove wiser than their descendants, who 'from childhood had known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make wise to salvation?'—pp. 6, 7.

This settles the value of antiquity merely as such. The *wisdom of our ancestors* is a nearly exploded maxim; and if any of our readers are met with what is thought a convincing argument,—the testimony of the fathers, let them ply the weapon Dr. Bennett has put into their hands, and they never need be afraid of an antagonist who trusts to armour drawn from such a quarter. We recommend the excellent and talented Mr. Blunt to peruse this little volume.

Having adverted to the testimony of Scripture as an independent witness, which can be relied on, because it carries in itself the evidence of its divine original; and shown that a vast majority of those who believe it, do so, not on account of the testimony of the church, to which only the learned few have the privilege of access, but because their own hearts and consciences testify that it is divine; our author proceeds to establish another great principle, that no priest, or bishop, or pope is the authorized interpreter of Scripture, but that *every* man has a right to judge for himself, responsible to God alone. He handles, without any ceremony, the pretensions of the church to this office, whether it be the Church of Rome or of England. He denies that the Christian clergy are priests; for in the church there is only *one* priest, the Lord Jesus Christ—'and all we are 'brethren.' Ministers are not the church, for it is a holy brotherhood; and whenever they have arrogated this exclusive right of interpretation, they have themselves grown careless how they interpret, and the consequence has been to 'deluge the church 'with the most shameless contempt for the word of God.' 'But,' says our author, 'some well-meaning but timid men exclaim, 'What! would you give to every ploughman or mechanic a 'right to interpret a book so difficult as the Scriptures, and to 'oppose their judgment to that of learned doctors, educated at 'colleges?' He boldly answers, YES; and in this we cordially join; and if any of our readers have a doubt of the propriety of what is thus so broadly stated, we refer them, for full satisfaction, to the argument on pp. 20—23.

The sole supremacy of Christ to legislate in his church is then fully discussed. Kings, and councils, and parliaments have no authority with Dr. Bennett in matters of religion: but he puts the argument so forcibly that we must let him speak for himself.

'We contend that it is our birthright to choose the religion we deem most scriptural, without being punished for it, in life, or limb, or



honour, or estate. . . . Yet how few reflect that the KING is the only person in the realm to whom the privilege is denied! He is bound down to the religion established by law, on penalty of the forfeiture of his crown. But who that knows the value of his soul . . . can reflect on the position of kings, without exclaiming, Is this the price paid for a crown? What a snare is laid for the soul of a king! For who will deny that a throne is a tempting seat, and that such martyrs as will sacrifice royalty to conscience are not often to be found? But mark the tortuous ways of the serpent. In the outset, contending that kings should choose the best religion for their subjects; and, in the end, forbidding the king to be of any other religion than that which his subjects have chosen for him. . . . By violating their subjects' liberty of religion, kings have lost their own. . . . Nor will they ever recover it, but by restoring that of their subjects.' p. 31.

The author proceeds to consider 'the right application of the 'Scriptural principles of Christian fellowship,' which leads him to notice the various forms of church government, which he separates, for good reasons that are stated, into Erastianism, Romanism, Prelacy, Presbyterianism, and Congregationalism. We are glad that Dr. Bennett is just as decided on these points as on all others; and, while he shows that there is a specific form of church government in the New Testament, and maintains that it is of importance to adhere to it, there is no disregard of the opposite views; on the contrary, they are examined with candour and temper. We have lately heard some eminent Nonconformists speak very vaguely on this point, who seem to have a notion that it is of very little consequence *what* form of church government prevails; and we have been afraid whether, under this indifference, there has not lurked a tendency to priestly domination and supremacy unknown or unsuspected by themselves. Dr. Bennett will help them to firmer and more scriptural opinions if they will read his book.

Of course the doctrine of apostolic succession meets with very little favour in these pages. Its absurdity was never exposed more effectually, or in a more masterly manner; and we regret that we have not space to lay the argument before our readers. The chapter on the officers of the church is admirable, and the discussion of the voluntary principle is equally so. The old objection, about leaving ministers to the mercy of the people, when they have grown grey in their service, is manfully met; and Dr. Bennett, as a minister, puts in a plea for the *people* too; and very properly asks whether 'the evils that arise in the working of a 'divine system, by fallible men, are to be instantly laid to the charge of 'the people alone? are ministers infallible or impeccable?' and he closes the argument by a contrast between the previous case and the compulsory forcing a minister on a people who have no power to obtain another; and shows that his condition is not im-

proved by remaining among those who dislike him personally, or disapprove his ministry.

'To all that has been said of the ill-treatment of ministers, in consequence of their dependence on the church's choice, more than a counterpoise can be adduced. For are not those who are placed over the flock, in defiance of its choice, exposed to *some* vexations? If such a man cannot be dismissed, he may stay only to be hated. . . . He that has been dismissed by a dissatisfied people has obtained his '*coup de grace*,' the finishing stroke; but he that remains among them is not the less broken on the wheel.' p. 104.

It is said very commonly, and those who say it think the argument incontrovertible, that a minister appointed by the people is almost sure to be unfaithful, in order to please his patrons. This argument cuts both ways. But it is less severe on the Congregationalists than the Endowed Church; since in the latter case the patron is often a *single person*. To please him the interests of the flock are likely to suffer. Among a number of persons a preacher must be an odd one indeed, or a very bad one indeed, if he have not *some* friends. We maintain, therefore, that the chances of fidelity, if we may place the argument in that position, are in our favour. A man who is dependent on the will of one person will most likely be a sycophant; he who is dependent on many, may, after all, find fidelity the best passport to the esteem and affection of his charge. Dr. Bennett has well remarked, 'he who, 'chosen by a congregation of faithful men, expects to please 'them by being unfaithful, must be a fool.' We well remember in our youthful days, a person expressing his preference for a plain, zealous, faithful preacher, because, to use his own words, '*he will not let me go to hell quietly*.' But, says our author,

'We may cut short this argument by an appeal to facts. Let us take ten thousand ministers appointed by law, and an equal number chosen by the people; let us listen to their oral instructions, and read their published discourses, and then let a jury of impartial men decide where the greatest amount of fidelity is to be found. As we readily admit that there are ministers who are not less faithful and laborious, because they can hold their livings in defiance of the people; there are also others who think too much of the glory of Christ, the value of souls, and the great day of account, to be able to bestow a thought on the power of the people to dismiss them from their charge.'

To this we heartily subscribe, and, should the experiment ever be tried, we are persuaded that we should receive a confirmation of our views for which our opponents are wholly unprepared.

The voluntary principle next comes under review. We would recommend the STANDARD to read this section before it next

thinks of reviling 'a' Rev. Mr. Burnett, (whom the *Standard* must know well enough), for maintaining that there were no compulsory payments in the Jewish church for religious purposes. The *Standard* may, in its polite language, tell us we are *liars*, when it ought to be whipped for its own ignorance and presumption. If the editor of that mendacious journal, so enlightened a champion of 'THE CHURCH,' *falsely so called*, would try and read a book, of which he seems deplorably ignorant, viz. the Bible, he would find that 'a' Mr. Burnett, who spoke at the meeting of the Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty, was neither a fool nor a liar, for saying what Dr. Bennett so amply *proves*; that compulsory payments for religious purposes were unknown to the Jewish religion. But such a recommendation, we fear, is vain, since hypocrites and calumniators shun the Scriptures, which fearfully denounces woe on those who *bear false witness against their neighbour*—unhappily, the *Standard's* daily vocation.

But our space is more than gone. We have found it very difficult to comprise within the necessary limits a notice of this timely and excellent publication. It is so closely interwoven, that it is no easy matter to make extracts without injuring their force, as they stand in the book itself. What we have transferred to our own pages will give an idea of the style and manner of the writer, and prove, we hope, a temptation to our readers to procure and read the work. It will richly repay a repeated perusal; and deserves much more consideration than its unpretending size and appearance might seem to require. We only regret that we cannot present a few extracts from the concluding section, on 'the Spirit in which the Scriptural principles of Christian fellowship should be studied and practised:' but we are obliged to dismiss the volume with our hearty thanks to the author, and our cordial recommendation of his volume to the public.

---

Art. VIII. *A Manual of Instruction on the Use and Governance of Time and Temper: Containing Selections from Holy Scripture, with Remarks; and Extracts from various English Authors. With an Introductory Address to the Young.* By the Rev. WILLIAM JOWETT, M. A., late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. London: Seeley and Burnside. 12mo. pp. xvii. 176.

THE extracts, of which this small volume chiefly consists, are taken from the writings of Izaak Walton, Lord Bacon, Sir Henry Wotton, Bishop Hall, George Herbert, Milton, Sir Matthew Hale, Jeremy Taylor, Leighton, Baxter, Ken, Watts, Law, Doddridge, Wesley, Scott, and Dr. Farre. It is not a severe



judgment that has been exercised by the compiler in respect either to their intrinsic merit, or their pertinence to his principal topics : they comprise, however, many valuable suggestions, and the work is, on the whole, adapted to its purpose. One subject is introduced which we commend to the consideration of those who are engaged in the Christian ministry, as having, in our opinion, more claim to their practical regard than it sometimes receives : we mean the necessity of securing to themselves a weekly Sabbath. Dr. Farre, in his evidence before a Select Committee of the House of Commons, makes the following important observations :

‘ I have been in the habit, during a great many years, of considering the *USES* of the Sabbath, and observing its *ABUSES*. The abuses are chiefly manifested in labour and dissipation. The use, medically speaking, is that of a Day of Rest. In a theological sense, it is a Holy Rest ; providing for the introduction of new and sublime ideas into the mind of man, preparing him for his future state.

‘ As a day of rest, I view it as a day of compensation for the inadequate restorative power of the body under continued labour and excitement. A physician always has respect to the preservation of the restorative power ; because, if once this be lost, his healing office is at an end. If I show you from the physiological view of the question, that there are provisions in the laws of nature which correspond with the Divine commandment, you will see, from the analogy, *that the Sabbath was made for man* as a necessary appointment. A physician is anxious to preserve the balance of circulation, as necessary to the restorative power of the body. The ordinary exertions of man *run down* the circulation every day of his life ; and the first general law of nature, by which God (who is not only the giver, but also the preserver and sustainer of life,) prevents man from destroying himself, is the alternating of day with night, that repose may succeed action. But, although the night apparently equalizes the circulation well, yet it does not sufficiently restore its balance, for the attainment of a long life. Hence, one day in seven, by the bounty of Providence, is thrown in, as a day of compensation ; to perfect, by its repose, the animal system.

‘ *Question.* In your own practice have you thought it necessary to carry on the whole of your occupation on a Sunday, as on the other six days in the week ?

‘ *Answer.* Certainly not.

‘ *Q.* Do you think your patients have suffered thereby ?

‘ *A.* Certainly not.

‘ *Q.* Of course, in extreme cases you do ?

‘ *A.* I consider that the two officers of healing, so to speak, are the clergyman and the medical man : they are the only two classes of persons called on to labour on that day, for the benefit of the community. I have found it essential to my own well-being, to abridge my labour on the Sabbath to what is actually necessary. I have frequently observed the premature death of medical men from continued exertion. In warm climates, and in active service, this is painfully apparent.

'Q. As a seventh day is absolutely necessary for the rest of man, what do you say to the habits of clergymen, who must, of necessity, labour on the seventh day?

'A. I have advised the clergyman, in lieu of his Sabbath, to rest one day in the week: it forms a continual prescription of mine. I have seen many destroyed by their duties on that day; and, to preserve others, I have frequently suspended them, for a season, from the discharge of those duties.

'Q. So that the clergyman furnishes an illustration of your own principle, as to the ill effects of working on the seventh day continually?

'A. Yes; certainly. I would say further, that (quitting the grosser evils of mere animal living, from over stimulation and undue exercise of body,) the working of the mind in one continued train of thought is destructive of life in the most distinguished class of society; and that senators themselves stand in need of reform in that particular. I have observed many of them destroyed by neglecting this economy for life.

'Q. Therefore, to all men, of whatever class, who must necessarily be occupied six days in the week, you recommend them to abstain on the seventh; and in the course of life they would gain by it?

'A. Assuredly they would, by giving to their bodies the repose, and to their minds the change of ideas, suited to the day, for which it was appointed by unerring Wisdom.

'Q. And, in fact, more mental work would be accomplished in their lives?

'A. Certainly, by the increased vigour imparted.

'Q. A human being is so constituted, that he needs a day of rest, both from mental and bodily labour?

'A. Certainly. You have drawn the inference, from the tenor of my evidence and argument, which I wish to leave on the mind of the legislative body.'—p. 176.

Respecting this interesting statement, Mr. Jowett remarks:

'My attention was first attracted to this document, by hearing how skilfully this physician had been wont to counsel persons of my own profession, on the prolongation of their life and usefulness. My mite of evidence I gladly contribute to his scientific and experienced decision; for, so far back as two and twenty years since, when I was suffering from over exertion in my clerical duties in a large provincial town, the very same advice here given, was then suggested to me by a medical friend; and I adopted it. By steadily pursuing this plan, devoting one of my week-days to comparative leisure, through God's blessing I recovered tone; and to this it may be attributed, that I did not, as I have seen other young clergymen do, sink under my early labours. Since that time, often have I impressed this Sabbatic principle upon my brethren in the ministry; and more especially on that class, with which I have been principally connected—missionaries. The uncongeniality of a foreign clime is, in fact, far less destructive

than incessant fatigue ; when, therefore, both are combined—wasting heat, and wearing labour—how can it be otherwise, than that the devoted evangelist should sink into an untimely grave ? I can add nothing to the doctrine so perspicuously, humanely, and authoritatively laid down in the document alluded to ; which, I am glad to see, by its chronological order, placed at the end of this Manual, closing my volume with an emphasis.’—p. xiii.

---

Art. IX. *Menzel on German Literature. Die deutsche Literatur. Von Wolfgang Menzel. 1836. Stuttgart.*

No. III.—German Book Trade.

**M**ENZEL'S Fifth Chapter is on the 'Commerce of Literature,' or, as we should say, the 'Book Trade.' It contains a deeply interesting account of the present state of literature, regarded as a branch of commerce. In many points a striking similarity will be observed between the present state of German Literature and that of the literature of our own country : as, for example, in the rage for cheap publications, penny magazines, and encyclopædias ; for compilations, abridgments, and *condensations* of universal science in pocket volumes ; in a word for *popularising* every branch of science and knowledge. This is a state of things, which, though in many respects full of hope and promise, is not without its disadvantages.—Another point of resemblance in the present state of the literature of the two countries—and this is matter of unmingled congratulation—is the demand for cheap and popular editions of all the most distinguished authors. Literature, therefore, as far, at least, as regards its form, seems to be taking the same course of development in both countries, and to have been wrought upon by the same general influences. There are happily *two* subjects, however, on which the English reader will be unable to sympathize with Menzel ; we refer to his remarks on the Piracy and the Censorship.—The following is the introduction, in which our author gives a description of what a bookseller may be and ought to be, and what he sometimes though rarely is,—the true patron and benefactor of literature.

‘ When we look back to the time when each book existed only in a few manuscripts, we may form some conception of the immeasurable superiority which the literature of the present day has attained by the machinery of the press and by the book trade. But though the former has been productive of blessings for all generations, and though we Germans shall eternally glory in the invention, yet all this should not blind us to some few disadvantages which the extended traffic in literature brings with it.



‘ Scarcely, for example, were the *natural* wants of literary intercourse, and the demand for the multiplication of good works satisfied by the beneficent mechanism of the press, than there was established thereupon, the *artificial* demand of the book trade. The manufacture of books has become a profitable branch of traffic; authors and booksellers, especially in the present day, have *speculated* in this trade; and in order to wheedle the public into the purchase of their manufactures, have addressed themselves to all the weaknesses of human nature, and to all the transient fashions of the age. Few, indeed, have been the booksellers who have acquired a name in history, or entitled themselves to the thanks of their country, by disinterestedly promoting the true, the fair, and the good, when these have required their support.—Should he possess capital, the bookseller has a fair field of action; he can aid the good author, he can counteract the bad; by a judicious selection of his commodities, he can in some measure regulate style and taste, and exercise an influence on the public like that which, in a small way, the managers of a theatre can exert by their judicious or injudicious selection of pieces for representation. He has a noble calling,—a calling highly honourable for his station—that of being a Mæcenas. By his patronage he can give many a genius free play; obscure or unacknowledged worth he can bring to light; and to him, not unfrequently, are we in the first instance indebted for the wisdom which has elevated, and the poetry which has ravished us. Lastly, by means of his position he can survey the whole field of literature, observe what is wanting, give salutary hints to authors, prepare the way for them, and secretly manage the manifold resources of scholarship and genius. But in order to do full justice to this honourable and important calling, the bookseller must have not only a clear head and a noble disposition, but also well economized capital: qualifications which are very seldom found united. When we consider further, that even the best bookseller is always dependent, in some measure, on the public and its fashionable caprices, and in some measure on authors, it is evident that we cannot expect the prosperity of literature from booksellers alone.’

The account which follows of the general character of booksellers, has, alas! but too much truth in it, whether we look at Germany or England, or indeed any other country. Nor, we fear, is the description of a certain large class of *authors* at all overdrawn, although we should hope that the description is less frequently realized in England than it was seventy or eighty years ago. The accounts which our dramatists and novelists of the last century have left us of our Grub-street worthies remarkably tally with the account which Menzel here gives of many of his countrymen; nor are *his* descriptions a whit less vivid than theirs.

' The majority of booksellers are mere shopkeepers, to whom  
 ' it is, for the most part, just the same whether they deal in corn  
 ' or truth, sugar or romances, pepper or satires;—provided always  
 ' they make money by them. The bookseller is either a manu-  
 ' facturer of books, or an agent, or both together. Books are  
 ' his *commodities*. His aim is gain; it is not the *absolute*, but  
 ' the *relative* goodness of the commodities which is the means to  
 ' that end; and *this* is determined by the demand of the pur-  
 ' chasers. That which attracts the most customers is, in the  
 ' *bookseller's* estimation, a *good* commodity, even though it were  
 ' the scandal of literature: what does not sell is a *bad* com-  
 ' modity, even though it were a revelation from the seventh  
 ' heavens. In order that a book may sell, it must be adapted to  
 ' the known taste of the public, or it may flatter its weaknesses  
 ' or inclinations, and thus originate a new fashion. It is for this  
 ' reason that publishers countenance what is trivial and adven-  
 ' turous.—In order that the public may be informed that the  
 ' book corresponds to its taste, the title must allure it. On this  
 ' account, a good title is often of more value to the publisher than  
 ' a good book, or at least the latter often depends upon the former;  
 ' and hence there often arises a rivalry amongst the booksellers as  
 ' to who can concoct the most *taking* title. But whence does the  
 ' bookseller attain such commodities as he pronounces good?  
 ' They do not spring up wild in such abundance as that he could  
 ' grow rich by them. They must be produced by *art*. Hence  
 ' has been generally introduced the system of *fattening* authors,  
 ' instead of leaving them to their scanty Alpine pasture. The  
 ' publisher *keeps* them; and they, in exchange, give him back  
 ' milk, butter, cheese, and, at last, skin and bone. And is the  
 ' bookseller ever at a loss for such cattle? On the contrary,  
 ' they throng to his free commons in greater numbers than he  
 ' wants. The larger the quantities manufactured the worse they  
 ' will be; the worse, the lighter; the lighter, the better will the  
 ' people be fitted for them. Besides since the crowd of students  
 ' has become so great, Germany swarms with persons who, in  
 ' want of employment, embark their knowledge in the book trade,  
 ' and thus deluge the world with a prodigious number of unripe  
 ' school-boy performances.

' One of the most industrious book-makers is Bäuerle, of  
 ' Vienna, who is perpetually bringing out some new collection of  
 ' panegyrics on the Imperial Family; he thus compels the ser-  
 ' vants of the State, if they would not be taken for disloyal sub-  
 ' jects, to exchange their precious gold for his farragos.

' But even old-established, distinguished, celebrated authors,  
 ' not unfrequently vie with the speculative bookseller in abusing  
 ' the credit of their name; and in treating the public, who it may  
 ' be, has been pleased with one of their books because really

‘good, with ten or twenty bad ones. In these cases every scrap of old paper is rummaged out and offered to sale as some precious rarity; while memoranda, occasional pieces, correspondence, fill long rows of costly volumes with the veriest common-place; common-place which the public is good enough to buy out of mere respect for the name of the author.’

The description he gives of the extent to which piracy is carried on in Germany is truly astounding: one is shocked at the effrontery and impudence of it. The only freedom of the press which the Germans enjoy seems to be that of robbing the poor author of his copyright.

‘The foulest blot upon the German book-trade is the still subsisting piracy, which, especially in Austria, drives a wholesale trade. In Wirtemberg, where I live, we swarm with these privileged thieves, who, with astounding impudence, puff off their articles in the public papers, glory in their robbery, and insult the regular publisher. It is not to be denied that some few publishers, both of note and of no note at all, fix their articles at an extortionately high price; and that this excessive dearness is obviated by the piratical press in a manner most advantageous to the reading public. This accidental advantage, however, does not justify the theft. The Crispin who stole leather in order to make out of it shoes for the poor was not the less a scoundrel on that account. Piracy, if not so injurious, is yet quite as worthy of reprobation as false coining.’

‘But piracy will soon disappear out of Germany, while the manufacture of bad books will still continue. Against this then will we also contend. We will be as inexorable to the literary *canaille* as to the literary aristocrats.’

The following is his account of the mob of authors—this literary *canaille*.

‘He who once writes for gold has already abandoned all shame; one man because he *must*, out of pure desperation; another of design, like a buffoon, in order to attract a greater number of spectators. The customary vices of these book-makers are:—a shamelessness which shrinks from no means of exciting attention, or at least of obtaining a sale;—brutal insult of the honest author whose trade they spoil;—the pandering to wicked and shameful inclinations, and the palliation of vice, partly in order to prepare a productive field, which better authors abandon to them, partly in order to make their readers their accomplices;—hypocrisy, (when gainful) of piety or honesty for the purpose of extorting a dear-bought penny;—shameless theft, or plagiarism from the best works, provided they have been successful; and, lastly, the all-embracing, all-penetrating *triviality*, the insipid broth in which the whole mess is cooked.’ . . .



‘The scholar writes because he thinks he is wiser than others, and because he accounts authorship his right and his duty; those who are not initiated in the mystery,\* write because they think themselves more sound and judicious than the learned, and because, in wishing to lead us back to *nature*, they consider their own opinions true. Lastly, there is an ever-recurring delusion on the part of the silly, the vain, and the young, that what is new to *them* must necessarily be so to all the rest of the world. Thus there are daily published new books on science which contain not a single idea new to the world, however new all may have been to the author. As for poetry, there is no remedy; when a youth falls in love, he thinks that the whole world, for the first time, has fallen in love too. He scribbles verses, and fancies that nobody has ever heard the like.’

The following is his account of the present attempts to present every branch of science and learning in a *popular* form. His remarks on the good and evil effects, which follow from this attempt, apply most exactly to our own country; and his observations on the *true* mode of writing for the people, and on the difficulties which attend the task, are in the highest degree philosophical and just.

‘We busy ourselves more and more in the attempt to write *popularly*—to communicate to the great mass of the people every thing, either useful or instructive, that has been gained either from foreigners or from scholarship. The very severest sciences are so managed that even the uneducated get a smack of them. We have systems of ‘Mythology for the *Ladies*,’ ‘*Popular Lectures on Astronomy*,’ ‘*Systems of Domestic Medicine*,’ ‘*Every Man his own Doctor*,’ ‘*Universal Histories for the Young*,’ ‘*All Secular Science in a Nut-shell*,’ and ‘*Theology in eight volumes*’ or ‘*Hours of Devotion*,’ and the like. We hold (as at Christmas) a sort of universal children’s fair, and the booksellers’ shops are crammed with writings for the ‘*elegant*’ world, for the ‘*people*,’ for the ‘*educated*’ classes, for the ‘*ladies*,’ for the ‘*German*’ women, for those of ‘*riper*’ age, for the ‘*dear*’ ‘*tender*’ youth, for the ‘*sons and daughters*’ of the nobility, for the ‘*citizen and countryman*,’ for ‘*every body*,’ for ‘*readers of all kinds*,’ in short for just as many as the booksellers’ drum can muster together.

‘Considered *in* and *for* itself, the attempt to write intelligibly, and to instruct the uneducated middle classes, is as worthy of praise as that lettered pride which boasts of its hieroglyphical vocabulary, and is proud that the mass of the common people does not understand it, is worthy of reprobation. Even the

---

\* In the original ‘*Die Profanen*.’

‘ little severity with which, in popular exposition, scientific subjects are customarily treated, and the insipid tone which thus creeps into them, is partly excused for the sake of the public, to whose powers of comprehension the author must adapt himself, if he wishes to be listened to and understood. Meanwhile it must not be denied that here again we have many self-constituted authors, who are most mischievous. Even the most superficial fellow takes upon him to write for the *people*, though he would be ashamed to write for the learned. Every one thinks the people good enough to furnish him with an auditory, and bad enough to justify him in offering them the veriest nonsense. Nothing appears so easy as to write for the people; for the less art an author employs, so much the sooner is he understood; the more he talks at random and the more vulgar and common-place his style, the better will it harmonize with the mass of his readers; the more deeply he stoops to the contractedness, the brutality, the prejudices, and unworthy inclinations of the many, so much the more does he flatter them, and is, in return, flattered by them. Hence, to write for the people *badly* is, to a *bad author*, easy and profitable; and for this reason it is practised to a most offensive extent. But to write for the people *well*, is surely a most difficult task, and hence we find it so rarely accomplished. If a man wishes to improve and enoble the *mass*, he runs the hazard of displeasing them; if he would instruct them upon lofty subjects, it is in the highest degree difficult to hit the right *tone*. He either keeps the *subject* too exclusively before his eyes, and then discusses it too learnedly and unintelligibly, or he as exclusively regards the *multitude*, and then profanes the subject by a style of exposition all too trivial, and which often has the appearance of *burlesque*. In this respect the author fails as frequently as the preacher.’

He next sketches the progress of literature as a *trade*, and thus forcibly traces the effects of this great revolution:

‘ Meanwhile, out of that chaos of books to which the mere spirit of speculation has given rise, many good consequences are beginning to develope themselves. In the attempt to stimulate or *artificially* excite the demand, for the purpose of meeting it by new publications, men at last naturally discovered the *real* demand, the supply of which must, under all circumstances, be profitable to the book-manufacturers. To this is to be attributed the unprecedentedly cheap editions of the most distinguished productions of literature; editions which at once secure to the public the advantage of obtaining the most excellent works at very little cost, and allow the publisher to enrich himself, in spite of his low prices, by the immense number of purchasers.

‘ To the same causes are to be attributed, further, the Ency-

‘ clopædias, Conversation-Lexicons, Pocket Libraries, Resumés.  
 ‘ If these works are still, in a great measure, chargeable with superficiality, they, at least, prepare the way for better works of  
 ‘ the same kind; and who can deny that by such cheap encyclopædic literature, knowledge of various kinds is widely diffused  
 ‘ among all classes? The Conversation Lexicon of Brockhaus, for example, has, it is admitted, many defects. It is in some  
 ‘ places too short, and in others too long; but still, as it is in every body’s hands, it scatters amongst the middle classes an  
 ‘ endless variety of information.

‘ But it is principally Periodical Literature which meets the demand for a rapid survey of the field of literature. Without it  
 ‘ the book-mart would resemble a monstrous city, that was full of  
 ‘ houses, but had no streets or squares. . . .

‘ The private libraries diminish, while the literary circle generally, and the museum and coffee-house readers increase. In  
 ‘ the mean time our German papers are far from possessing the prodigious circulation of the English and French. Our political  
 ‘ dismemberment, our being divided into so many states and cities, each possessing its local interests and local newspapers, would  
 ‘ effectually keep down this great branch of traffic, even if that only  
 ‘ bond of union which we possess, I mean the restraints on the press, did not every where clip its pinions, wherever they should  
 ‘ begin to grow strong. Our political papers, if they are servile, live a perpetual death; if they are liberal, perish—but perish to be  
 ‘ immortal. The remaining journals, scattered throughout the circles of Germany, are divided into the academical literary gazettes, which are the organs of the several universities, and the  
 ‘ papers devoted to Belles Lettres, which are in great measure calculated only for women readers. We shall speak of them in  
 ‘ their respective departments.’

We must close this chapter by giving our author’s eloquent and indignant exposure of the evils of the censorship. It is imbued with a deeply philosophical spirit; is full of noble and manly sentiments, and reflects equal lustre on his genius, honesty, and patriotism. It is refreshing to see a German thus lifting up his voice against that intellectual tyranny which degrades his country: and, while we wonder that a nation so enlightened should need such an appeal, we may wonder, also, that so many can resist it. It must, however, have no inconsiderable effect in opening the eyes of the German public to the enormity of the evil.

‘ As, generally, the political press of Germany has favoured indolence—night-cap philosophy—and, in the absence of other  
 ‘ kinds of activity, the mechanical manufacture of books; so, by the very same cause, has the spirit of literature been destroyed by  
 ‘ the censorship of the press, what is good has been repressed, and, what is bad has been encouraged. Many a blooming flower is shut



‘ up in shade, while the weeds are permitted to spring up luxuriantly. It must be admitted, at the same time, that the restrictions on the press only extend to certain branches of literature; and that others, on which no censorship exercises its pruning-knife, are as deeply corrupted. One can only say that the restraint on the press damps the spirit of a nation generally, even while it may only repress it in some single direction;—just as the whole body becomes diseased, if a single member be impaired.

‘ The influence which books exercise upon opinion, and the influence which opinion exercises upon conduct, render literature an important object of *politics*. As far as each state claims a right of existence, and consequently not only the *right*, but also the *duty*, of self-preservation, it must necessarily take care that literature does not diffuse any opinions that would endanger that existence. This object it endeavours to secure by means of the *censorship*. But whether that end, which is sanctioned by a political right, does not contradict the universal rights of human nature; whether on that account it can be attained, or whether the means employed, namely, the censorship, be the *right* means,—these are altogether different questions. Man has an original right of communicating his sentiments; in the liberty of doing so originates all improvement, and improvement is the highest aim of the species. Let but a state interdict such communication, and improvement is stopped. If the first state had originally possessed both the right and the power to prevent the intercourse of its citizens, civilization would have been impossible: we should not have made, as yet, a single step towards it. But we have already advanced *many* steps. And why? Either because the State has not prevented this liberty of communication, or because the rights of man have triumphed over the rights of State, and, by means of revolutions, have destroyed despotic forms of government, and re-established free.

‘ Men should not derive *right* from *might*, but *might* from *right*. Mere power has just as much right to authorize infanticide as the censorship. Is it, indeed, possible that a censorship completely preventing the freedom of the press, or generally, that any *police* system, the object of which is to *prevent* possible evils, should harmonize so well with the liberty and welfare of the people as a *judicial* system, the object of which is to punish *overt* acts of crime? If society is jealous even of judicial power, how much more jealous must she be of a power which, still more formidable than the Fehmgericht,\* not only decides in secret, but even before the facts. It is acknowledged that the only

---

\* Anciently, the Secret Court of Criminal Justice in Westphalia.—TRANSE.

‘guarantee for the upright performance of duty is—publicity. The censorship requires at least as sure a guarantee, yet publicity is incompatible with its very nature! Its duty is just to prevent the publication of certain sentiments. But now how can the censorship be exercised without caprice and injustice creeping in? Amidst the prodigious variety of all possible thoughts and modes of expression, it can never find a sure rule which shall determine its approbation or disapprobation. We can put no fixed measure into the hands of the censor; we must leave the sentence entirely to him, just as we would to the decision of a jury. A jury, however, is controlled by the people; but who is to control the secret tribunal of the censor?

‘While power is generally subordinate to *law*, a severe press-law, which should punish every offence *when fully proved*, seems quite sufficient for securing the public interests; but let excessive power once enslave law to itself, and from that moment will it establish the censorship. It is in the very nature of the thing to do so. Thus in France, the monarchical censorship was merely supplanted by a democratical censorship. The censorship always shifts with power, no matter what that power may be.

‘The prime advantage which accrues from the entire freedom of the press, is the disarming of the *impudence* of the press. This impudence is powerful and dangerous only in proportion as it seems to imply unusual courage and daring. It loses all its weight the moment it becomes common. England has demonstrated the truth of this long ago. There they look upon the most venomous effusions of the press as no more than what they really are,—the impotent attempts of a discomfited minority. MEN NO LONGER WONDER AT IT—that is the secret of the liberty of the press. The boldness that is seen *every day*, is no longer considered as *boldness*, but merely as *what is seen every day*. The license of the press must be forbidden if it should have the *charm* of what is forbidden. A licensed offence is no offence at all. Many hundred libels and caricatures were published against Pitt, without in the slightest degree injuring his great fame. But with us, Kotzebue’s ‘Barth,’ with the iron front, will probably be the subject of wonder for a hundred years to come; while, in Paris or London, such lampoons are forgotten the day after to-morrow. With us, one individual who was the object of Kotzebue’s ridicule in that publication, was driven mad by it; in Paris or London he would merely have laughed at it. The difference consists simply in *custom*. Certainly, however, there is no better method of vanquishing calumny, hatred, or envy, than by suffering it publicly to prostitute itself,—to bawl itself hoarse.

‘The freedom of the press is the sun which gradually extracts from the poison which is exposed to its beams all its virulence;

‘while it was shut up in darkness, it retained that virulence, ready to exert itself as occasion offered. The freedom of the press is the open air, in which those vapours are dispersed which, while they remained pent up in a narrow place, retained their destructive power. The French ministry have certainly acted unwisely in conferring upon the press, which had already begun to render itself despicable by its insolence, the honours of martyrdom.\*

‘But the advantages which the censorship deprives us of are less tolerable than the evils it inflicts. That it sometimes suppresses truth is bad, but it is still worse that it gives encouragement to falsehood and insipidity. Without doubt it has contributed to that barren and fantastical style of thought which flies from practical life, and still more to those distorted judgments which, especially in political literature, are universally expressed. We may play the enthusiast as much as we please, especially if we convey our thoughts in an unintelligible philosophical language; but as to the practical application of our theories we dare not think of it, even when we would. Many a man who will speak the truth, designedly veils it in a mist, through which an ordinary censor, and even an ordinary public, cannot penetrate. On the other side, our practical men busy themselves about the most jejune empirical courses, and take good care not to notice the better theory, while they palliate their indolence on political considerations. Lastly, there is a multitude of authors, who, buried in the arctic circle of politics, never arrive at more than a crippled growth; who, without being perfidious, still are not honourable; who, without telling lies, still do not venture to tell the truth; and, in pitiable indecision, are willing to please at the same time both the censor and the spirit of the age. Their element is emphatically, *insipidity*, and, in a time like the present, they feel quite at home. So much do they exhaust themselves in invectives against the censorship, that it is almost of as much use to *them* as to the *ultras*. They seat themselves with cunning airs on their chairs, and give out their oracle; enjoining, with finger on nose, mysterious silence when any important truth is concerned; rejecting every thing of the least importance as too much, and embellishing every nonentity into a matter of some importance. People, who, in a time of excitement, would not open their mouth, now chatter themselves sick. They recover themselves from their long silence. They do not disguise that they write somewhat superficially;

---

\* This was written just before the Revolution of 1830! Menzel's opinion, therefore, was but too faithfully verified; and, alas! it is but too likely that it will be verified again.—TRANSLATOR.



‘but then they silyly whisper in your ear that they do it—*on purpose*; that one must tread softly; that we must let but a little be understood at a time;—in the background,—there it is that much is still concealed!

‘. . . . . For the rest, it is not all minds that will suffer themselves to be emasculated. The censorship, even when it is conjoined with the grossest tyranny, cannot stop the deep breath of life—our spiritual respiration. We may tie a bird fast by its beak and break its wing, but it will still live and breathe through the open bones.

‘Truth is not utterly lost, even though we may not be able to stumble upon it in every street. It roots itself the faster in the mind the less it can be imparted and the less one can exert oneself on its behalf. A nation upon which a censorship is imposed, is already sufficiently advanced in cultivation to be capable of *thinking* what it dare not *utter*. Certain it is, that any more rigorous restraints on the press, any new intellectual interdicts, if indeed they shall ever be introduced, will have just as little effect as those which have hitherto been employed. There is but *one* spell which can bind the spirit. It is called *freedom and right*. He who forgets this spell may bind men’s minds with cords and fetters; but he will not *effectually* bind them. He may bury them alive and heap lime upon them the whole year long, but suddenly they will rise again in triumph over the grave, and mock at it. It often happens, however, that in place of the good spirits which men have expelled, the evil enter uninvited. He who will not make peace with the former, must often, against his will, wage war with the latter; and they in terrible wrath destroy the exorcists. The pure and temperate air of freedom is universally healthy, and the true element of peace and order. It is only the oppressive sultriness of the censorship which produces those popular tempests which are ushered in with blasting thunders. We often haggle with moderate *Doctrinaires* about a single grain, where anarchists some time after measure it out by bushels.—Since men must be addressed, let good care be taken who is the speaker; lest, while the one party is silent, another should begin whose talk is like the roaring of lions or the raging of the ocean. Why did Tarquinius permit the six books of the Sybil to be burnt? In *them* good fortune was announced. There remained to him only the three last, which prophesied nothing but misfortune.

‘That the German people can think in spite of the censorship, it has proved; and it has long since been apparent that what it *thinks* it will also *say*. In the year 1831, it is well known that the press took a vigorous flight.

‘Even in the absence of the freedom of the press, even while chafing in the strait fetters of the censorship, public spirit in

‘the present crisis of Europe has operated most beneficially on our literature. Let any man read with impartial eyes the numerous and continually increasing political Journals, and he must confess that, both in the subjects which are discussed in them, and the spirit in which they are discussed, these journals are most advantageously distinguished from those of an earlier period. Let any man compare the spirit of our present political journalism with that which prevailed from 1813 to 1819, and he must acknowledge that we have come back from the reveries and extravagancies of that period; and that we are now no longer busied about empty theories and romantic fantasies, but about the results of experience; about positive rights, and well-defined local necessities. Let him survey the vast number of thoroughly practical and well-written articles which daily appear in the different German papers, and he cannot disguise from himself that political culture has already deeply penetrated the mass of the people; that it no longer dwells with certain Coryphæuses of literature, many of whom must draw back in shame before the public spirit of the people.’

ART. X. *Die Lehre von der Sünde, und vom Versöhner, oder die wahre Weihe des Zweiflers von A. Tholuck vierte Auflage.* Hamburg: 1832. [*The Doctrine concerning Sin and the Propitiator, &c.* By A. THOLUCK. Fourth Edition. Hamburg: 1832.]

**L**ECTORI benevolo Salutem. It may be in the memory of some of our courteous readers, that in the notice which we gave of Mr. Ryland's excellent translation of the above work in our March number, some regret was expressed that an author of such distinguished reputation and influence as Dr. Tholuck should permit certain representations, with which he had expressed himself dissatisfied, and which we could not read with unconcern, to remain unaltered in three successive editions. Circumstances have since brought to our knowledge, what, perhaps, justice requires that we should mention here—some explanations of Dr. Tholuck himself upon the subject. In our notice of Mr. Ryland's translation, we were indebted to a learned friend for the use of the third edition of the original work: our own, which is the fourth edition, not being, at that time, in this country. We now extract from it the preface then just published, and which contains the explanations to which we have referred.

‘To not a few persons has the present work, under the divine blessing, been rendered serviceable, in first conducting them into that inward sanctuary of experimental truth, which is laid open unto all whose life is hid with Christ in God. As the production of a period when its author strove to satisfy his new-born youthful thirst at that fountain of holiness which, after a boy-

hood too early abandoned, through parental influence and example, to a cheerless scepticism, was revealed to him by faith in the Redeemer, it is of the excellence and fulness of the believer's hidden life that his gushing heart here pours forth its feelings. The palace of truth, however, is accessible through more than one portal; and that vigorous, sanguine, exuberant life, which unfolds itself in a youthful soul entering into the sanctuary of the Christian faith after the hard conflicts of early doubt, is not alike intelligible to all. This book has, therefore, found friends and favour chiefly amongst the young, and of them, those have most valued it whose breasts have been expanded, without being satisfied, by the aspirations of a poetic temperament. For their sakes let the work remain what it is.

For a long time, however, I have wished to serve again the office of a guide upon the self-same road, only commencing the journey from a more advanced stage, and developing more prominently, and in a manner more suitable to the necessities of the present times, the historical evidences of the Christian faith. Was the truth of Christianity formerly confirmed, chiefly on the evidence of miracle and prophecy, or from such historical sources, in opposition to which Lessing called for the evidence of 'THE SPIRIT AND OF POWER,' the question turns at present principally on internal evidence; and if, in one respect, the Christian should rejoice at this, as an evident approximation to the acknowledgment of the inwardness of real religion, he must not, on the other hand, forget that such endeavours, when exclusive, often evaporate in metaphysical subtleties, and must desire that the historical evidences also should receive their due attention.

Should leisure, therefore, be granted me, and should the service be undertaken by no one better qualified to do it justice, I feel considerable inclination to publish, on some future day, a companion to the present work, in which the truth of Christianity shall be demonstrated on its historical side. By this means much which is here but partially exhibited will receive more adequate treatment, and be set forth in its appropriate relations.'

\* \* \* \* \*

Though this explanation does not exactly satisfy our objections, which applied principally to the mistakes into which our author appeared to have fallen, in reference to the use of reason in matters of faith, it will be seen that it does, in some degree, account for the unaltered publication of the work, and let us into the reasons of that exclusive manner in which the subject is treated. Dr. Tholuck is not the first distinguished theological writer who has reason to acknowledge that his first survey of the field of Christian evidence was too limited and partial. Two



eminent instances have been furnished in our own nation by Dr. Chalmers and Mr. Thomas Erskine, the former of whom has handsomely admitted and supplied the deficiency of his earlier views. That Dr. Tholuck also has fulfilled the pledge which he had given in the preceding preface is a fact alike honourable to himself, and interesting to the friends of evangelical religion. A vehement attack upon the credibility of the gospels, published in 1835, 1836, by Dr. Strauss, of Tübingen, has called him again into the field, and in his answer to that work he has entered deeply into the historical evidences of Christianity. This publication is entitled, '*Die Glaubwürdigkeit der evangelischen Geschichte,*' &c.—'The credibility of the Gospel history, with a review of the life of Jesus, by Strauss, represented to theological and non-theological readers, by Dr. A. Tholuck. Hamburg: 1837. pp. 464.' We hope to present our readers with an analysis of both works in the course of our next volume.

---

Art. XI. *Pastoral Appeals on Conversion.* By the Rev C. STOVEL. 12mo. London: Jackson & Walford.

WE know not which to admire most, the excellent object of the writer of this little volume, or the deep piety with which it is imbued. They are both highly creditable to the Author as a Christian minister, and are worthy of imitation by all who sustain the same important character in the church of Christ. It is of the first importance that those who are '*hearers of the word and not doers of it,*' should be faithfully admonished of their danger, and of the wide difference that there is between the mere appendages to the Ark and those who occupy its sacred enclosure. This has been done by Mr. Stovel with fidelity and force. His volume displays an intimate acquaintance with the workings of the human mind and the operation of religious principle, and cannot be attentively perused without benefit. We cordially recommend it to the immediate attention of our readers.

---

Art. XII. *The Antiquities of Greece.* By JOHN POTTER, D. D. With Notes, &c. By JAMES BOYD, LL.D. London: Tegg. 1837.

THIS work is too well known to require any comment, and we shall therefore confine ourselves to a simple statement of the distinguishing features of the present edition. Much additional matter has been introduced, numerous plans and illustrations have been borrowed from works of distinguished merit, the authorities have been verified by a reference to the best editions of the classics, the indices have been enlarged, 'and the two volumes of the original have been reduced, by the use of a smaller type, and by the omission or curtailment of the quotations with which they were overloaded, to *one* cheap and portable volume.' In its present form the work can scarcely fail to be adopted as a school-book throughout the kingdom.

### Art. XIII. LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

**THE BRITISH MUSEUM.**—The public are admitted to the British Museum on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, between the hours of ten and four, from the 7th of Sept. to the 1st of May; and between the hours of ten and seven, from the 7th of May to the 1st of Sept. Persons applying for the purpose of study or research are admitted to the reading rooms every day, from nine o'clock in the morning until four in the afternoon, between the 7th of Sept. and the 1st of May; and until seven in the evening, between the 7th of May and the 1st of Sept. Artists are admitted to study in the galleries of sculpture every day, between the hours of nine and four, except Saturday. The Museum is closed between the 1st and 7th of Sept., and on Ash Wednesday, Good Friday, and Christmas-day, and also on any special fast or thanksgiving days ordered by authority. The number of persons admitted to view the British Museum was, in 1831, 99,912; in 1836, 383,157. The number of visits made to the reading rooms, for the purpose of study or research, was about 1,950 in 1810; 62,360 in 1836. By artists and students to the galleries of sculpture, for the purpose of study, 4938 in 1831; 7,051 in 1836. To the print room, about 4,400 in 1832; 2,916 in 1836.

**PRINTING.**—In the course of the year 1836 there have been printed 66,32 works in Paris, written in French, English, German, Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Polish, &c., besides 1154 works of engravings and lithographs.

A Bust of the Rev. R. Hall has been executed by Mr. Charles Branwhite, younger son of Mr. R. C. Branwhite. In the opinion of Mr. Hall's most intimate friends in Bristol, the artist has succeeded admirably, and produced by far the most correct and characteristic likeness of Mr. Hall which has yet appeared. It may be seen at Mr. Ball's, the publisher of this Review, through whom also casts may be obtained.

#### *Preparing for Publication.*

A Volume is about to appear by R. WILMOT HORTON, Bart., Governor of Ceylon, under the title of *Letters of the Dead*; to which Notes and an Appendix will be added by the Editor. Among the correspondents are the names of Lord Grenville, Mr. Huskisson, Bishop Heber, Mr. Malthus, Mr. Simond of Geneva, and other eminently distinguished persons.

A Dictionary of the Anglo-Saxon Language, with Explanations in English and Latin, and copious English and Latin Indexes, serving as a Dictionary English and Anglo-Saxon, as well as of Latin and Anglo-Saxon. The Preface contains essays on the origin and connexion of the Anglo-Saxon, and the other Germanic tongues, a Map of Languages, and the essentials of Anglo-Saxon Grammar. By the Rev. Dr. Bosworth.

A small and cheap edition will be published at the same time, containing only the Anglo-Saxon Dictionary, and the Indexes.

A New Edition of the Summary of the Principles and History of Popery. To which will be prefixed remarks on so much of the late Dr. Milner's end of Religious Controversy as relates to the Rule of Faith, and on Dr. Wiseman's Lectures on the Real Presence. By John Birt.

Notes Abroad, and Rhapsodies at Home. By a Veteran Traveller. With Engravings.

#### *Just Published.*

England under Seven Administrations. By Albany Fonblanque, Esq. 3 vols. 12mo.

Society in America. By Harriet Martineau. 3 vols. 12mo.

Opinions of Lord Brougham on Politics, Theology, Law, Science, Education, &c.

Dr. Adam Clarke's Works, vol. X. Detached Pieces.

The Philosophy of Human Nature in its Physical, Intellectual, and Moral Relations. By Henry M'Cormac, M.D.

Primitive Christianity illustrated in Thirty Sermons. By W. Jones.

The Union of the Holy Spirit and the Church in the Conversion of the World. By Thomas W. Jenkyn.

Spartacus; or the Roman Gladiator. A Tragedy in Five Acts. By Jacob Jones, Esq.

